

William H. Hornibrook to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Persia.

James Marion Baker to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Siam.

Charles S. Wilson to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia.

#### SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Whitney Young	Bertel E. Kuniholm
Robert F. Fernald	Robert Y. Jarvis
John C. Shillock, Jr.	Richard S. Huestis
James W. Gantenbein	W. Quincy Stanton
Norris B. Chipman	Stanley G. Slavens
John L. Bouchal	

#### CONSULS GENERAL

John G. Erhardt  
O. Gaylord Marsh

#### CONSUL

Graham H. Kemper  
John H. MacVeagh

#### FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

A. Dana Hodgdon  
Clayson W. Aldridge  
Walton C. Ferris

#### FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, CLASS 1

Thomas M. Wilson

#### ASSISTANT TREASURER

Marion Glass Banister to be Assistant Treasurer.

#### ASSISTANT REGISTER OF THE TREASURY

Byrd Leavell to be Assistant Register of the Treasury.

#### SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT

Mark A. Skinner to be superintendent of the mint, Denver, Colo.

#### ASSAYER IN THE MINT

Bruce B. LaFollette to be assayer in the mint, Denver, Colo.

#### ASSAYER IN CHARGE OF THE MINT

Hugh T. Rippetto to be assayer in charge of the mint, New Orleans, La.

#### FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

William W. Howes to be First Assistant Postmaster General.

#### SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Harlee Branch to be Second Assistant Postmaster General.

#### MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

James M. Landis to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

#### MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Walter J. Cummings to be a member, board of directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Elbert G. Bennett to be a member, board of directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

#### MEMBERS OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Albert Simon Goss to be Land Bank Commissioner.  
Francis Winfred Peck to be Cooperative Bank Commissioner.

#### SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Eldon P. King to be Special Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

#### COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Carter H. Harrison to be collector, first district of Illinois.  
Seldon R. Glenn to be collector, district of Kentucky.  
Clinton A. Clauson to be collector, district of Maine.  
Joseph P. Carney to be collector, district of Massachusetts.  
Thomas J. Sheehan to be collector, first district of Missouri.  
Dan M. Nee to be collector, sixth district of Missouri.  
Peter M. Gagne to be collector, district of New Hampshire.

James J. Hoey to be collector, second district of New York.  
Frank Scofield to be collector, first district of Texas.  
Nathaniel B. Early, Jr., to be collector, district of Virginia.

#### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS SERVICE

Alfred A. Cohn to be collector of customs, district no. 27.  
Raymond Miller to be collector of customs, district no. 47.  
Howell Cone to be collector of customs, district no. 17.  
John H. Dooley to be collector of customs, district no. 1.  
Fountain Rothwell to be collector of customs, district no. 45.  
Adrian Pool to be collector of customs, district no. 24.  
I. Walke Truxtun to be collector of customs, district no. 14.  
Margaret M. McQuilkin to be collector of customs, district no. 48.

#### COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Samuel T. Ladd to be comptroller of customs, district no. 4.

#### REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Jessie M. Gardner to be register, land office, Denver, Colo.

#### COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

George E. Allen  
Melvin C. Hazen

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

#### PROMOTIONS

Omar C. Hopkins to be passed assistant sanitary engineer.  
Fortunat A. Troie to be surgeon.  
Carl E. Rice to be surgeon.  
Edward R. Marshall to be medical director.  
Emil Krulish to be medical director.  
Chapman H. Binford to be passed assistant surgeon.  
John A. Trautman to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Joseph A. Bell to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Edward C. Rinck to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Gordon A. Abbott to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Sidney P. Cooper to be passed assistant surgeon.  
George W. Bolin to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Elmer T. Ceder to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Waldemar C. Dreessen to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Noka B. Hon to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Otis L. Anderson to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Claude D. Head, Jr., to be passed assistant surgeon.  
Benjamin E. Holsendorf to be passed assistant pharmacist.  
Lon Oliver Weldon to be senior surgeon.  
Howard Franklin Smith to be senior surgeon.  
James Gayley Townsend to be senior surgeon.  
William Howard Slaughter to be senior surgeon.  
Joseph Bolten to be senior surgeon.  
LeGrand B. Byington to be surgeon.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1934

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our merciful Heavenly Father, there are no shore lines where Thou art. Even the wings of the morning are not mighty enough to carry us beyond Thy sheltering providence; somewhere and everywhere in all this old world is Thy mothering heart; we praise Thee. We beseech Thy wisdom and grace to help us to be spiritual architects, building upon those foundations that never give way. O let the temples of our immortal souls rise higher and higher and without the sound of a hammer. Do Thou manifest Thyself in all our works and keep us in touch with the teeming daily human life which is always unfolding itself before our open eyes. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### RULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1935

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from

North Carolina, I call up for consideration House Resolution 217 and ask that the same be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 217

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of H.R. 6663, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, all points of order against title II or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived; and no amendments or motions to strike out shall be in order to such title except amendments or motions to strike out offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, and said amendments or motions shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments shall not be in order to any other section of the bill H.R. 6663 or to any section of any general appropriation bill of the Seventy-third Congress which would be in conflict with the provisions of title II of the bill H.R. 6663 as reported to the House, except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the rule. Under this reservation I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, so we may know what the point of order is, I demand the regular order so that the point of order may be made. Then he can ask his question. We should like to know what the point of order is.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York to state his point of order.

Mr. SNELL. I ask the chairman of the committee if it is intended under the provisions of this rule, which is not drawn entirely in the usual manner, to take advantage under the peculiar wording of it to refuse to the minority the right to make the usual motion to recommit?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] will allow me to answer the gentleman's question, I may state this rule does not prevent a motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Does it prevent the usual motion to recommit?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know what the gentleman means by the usual motion.

Mr. SNELL. That is just the point I wish straightened out at this time. I mean the usual motion that is made to recommit a bill, where the minority have a right to put their position on pending legislation before the House for a vote, as is usually provided in and carried in every special rule that has ever been presented on the floor of the House, in language of the following import: "Except one motion to recommit."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I may state to the gentleman from New York that this rule, as the gentleman will understand by reading it—and we may as well be candid about it in the very beginning—

Mr. SNELL. We may as well be in the beginning of this discussion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it is always best. I may state to the gentleman that the rule as provided in this resolution does not prevent a motion to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman mean we cannot make the usual motion to recommit, which states the position of the minority in regard to the legislation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman desires a categorical answer to his question, I may say that, in conformity with the spirit and purpose of this rule, to protect the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations and what I believe is the attitude of the administration on this question, a simple motion to recommit to the committee would be in order under this rule.

Mr. SNELL. And nothing except the motion to recommit?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me state it again, so there will be no doubt about it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the rule that it is not a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, on the ground that it violates the general rules of the House by denying the right to the minority to make the usual and regular motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am familiar with the rights of the Committee on Rules to make privileged reports, they are entitled to report a rule at any time, with the two exceptions, and these exceptions are specifically set forth in section 725, page 327, of the Manual:

The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which shall provide that business under paragraph 7 of rule XXIV—

Which is the Calendar Wednesday rule—

shall be set aside by a vote of less than two thirds of the Members present—

The next exception covers the point I am making in my point of order—

nor shall it report any rule or order which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Paragraph 4 of rule XVI states the following:

After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution, one motion to recommit shall be in order.

Also rule XVII, section 1, provides—

It shall be in order, pending the motion for or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain a motion to commit with or without instructions to a standing or select committee.

It has been the precedent of the House for a great many years that under no circumstances will the minority be prohibited from making a motion to recommit, and I have yet never heard anyone express a different opinion on policy or philosophy of the rules of the House. In this way the minority is allowed to place its position before the Congress, and, if enough Members approve of it, they are entitled to a roll-call vote. I have never heard anyone take a different position on the floor of the House. But it is evident, from what the gentleman from Alabama says, that they intend, by the particular wording of this rule, to take advantage of the situation and to deny the minority the right of making such a motion. For this reason I maintain the rule is subject to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The motion to recommit does not permit anything in it that is not in order under a bill.

Mr. SNELL. I did not say that it did.

Mr. BLANTON. This rule merely shows what is in order under this bill. A motion to recommit to the committee can well be made.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman does not understand at all the point I was arguing.

Mr. BLANTON. This is the crux of the whole thing. This is the same kind of a rule we had under the Johnson legislation.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman never saw a rule like this during his membership in this House.

Mr. BLANTON. We had a rule to suspend all rules under that Johnson veterans' legislation on June 26, 1930.

Mr. SNELL. I do not remember what he makes reference to, but I know we have never passed a rule that denies the right to the minority to make the usual motion to recommit.

Mr. BLANTON. A rule which was so tight you could not change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman still does not understand the point of my argument at all.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no point to it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am afraid the gentleman is confused, and honestly so. This is not a rule for the reporting of a bill which would carry the usual provision that there should be the right of a motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Yes. Stop right there for a moment.



Mr. O'CONNOR. This is a rule pertaining to a matter in a bill. The bill comes before the House by privilege, coming from the Committee on Appropriations. Therefore no rule is needed in order that the bill may be considered. This rule is directed to points of order against a certain provision in the bill. Now, the gentleman said that under the rules all rules from the Committee on Rules should contain a provision permitting a motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. I do not think that is absolutely necessary, although it is generally carried. We will not argue that point.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Rule XI itself gives the right to recommit whether or not anything is said in the special rule itself.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; but the gentleman from Alabama said frankly that he expected to limit the motion to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee to a motion to recommit without any instructions whatever. This is definitely against the rules of the House and the whole philosophy and precedents on which the rules are founded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the gentleman concluded his statement?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; I have concluded my statement for the present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In reply to what the gentleman from New York said, the matter now pending before the Speaker for decision is on a point of order reserved by the gentleman from New York, to wit, that the rule reported and now pending violates the standing rules of the House with reference to a motion to recommit a bill. There is nothing in this rule, as I stated to the gentleman before, that would deny to any Member a motion to recommit the bill. There is nothing in this rule that would prevent any Member from offering a motion to recommit on any other phase of the bill except that covered by title II.

As I stated to the gentleman, we might as well put all the cards on the table now as hereafter, because this will come up if the rule is adopted as a matter of parliamentary construction.

Mr. SNELL. That is the reason I brought the matter up at this time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no reason for equivocation about that. The purpose of this rule, if we have the votes to adopt it, is to protect, as I stated to the gentleman, the integrity of title II of the pending bill in toto. Under this rule, if adopted, a motion could be made to recommit to the Appropriations Committee. A motion could be made, and would be in order, to recommit with instructions as to any other item or items in the bill not covered by title II. But it is my opinion, and I think the Chair would so hold, that a motion to recommit with instructions affecting matters under title II would not be in order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. As I understand it, there are a number of gentlemen on both sides of the aisle who would like to vote for a return to the old-salary basis. The gentleman has repeatedly referred to title II without qualifying his remarks. I am asking the gentleman for information at this time. Many of the Members on the floor of the House do not know what title II encompasses. It may cover many things in many different directions. Is not the rule intended to deliberately prevent a vote on the question of returning to the old-salary basis that we had before March 4 of last year?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman may vote against the bill if he so desires.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; but then a motion cannot be made to recommit, with instructions to the committee to bring back another bill based upon old salaries.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I stated that to the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. But the gentleman did not state it clearly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I stated it very clearly. I believe the gentleman from New York understood it. I am not responsi-

ble for the understanding of the gentleman from Illinois in all cases.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a decision.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. For what purpose?

Mr. KVALE. For the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. The rule applies also to all other appropriation bills that are to be brought in at this session, does it not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It applies to all other appropriation bills that may be brought in at this session if there is an attempt made to affect the provisions covered by title II of this bill. In other words, allow me to state to the gentleman from Minnesota the naked fact with reference to it. These are the views of the majority leadership in this House, and I am not putting myself in that category because I am a mere private in the ranks, and of the President of the United States, as I understand it, and I think this will be explained to the House by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The purpose of this whole controversy here today is to have the House deliberately determine for today and hereafter during the remainder of this session whether or not they are going to follow the President's recommendations or not. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. That is the point, whether they are with him or against him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The purpose of this rule is to get the sentiment of the House as it affects the economy bill, or whether they are going to pursue some other policy and the gentleman is right in the construction of the rule, as indicated by the query he has submitted.

Mr. SNELL. I am not going to take any exception to the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama except to this one effect. I have no objection to the Democrats in this House following the President of the United States, but we have a right to demand that they follow him according to the prescribed rules of the House of Representatives of the United States. [Applause.] I know that the interpretation they are putting on this rule is contrary to the spirit of the rules of this House and to every precedent of the House in the last 20 years.

I have not been able in the short time I have had to find many decisions, but I want to call the Speaker's attention to a decision by Speaker Gillett, found at the bottom of page 328 of the Manual, which reads as follows:

The Committee on Rules cannot report a rule which is aimed strictly or directly at overthrowing Calendar Wednesday or the motion to recommit.

There is another decision by Speaker Cannon and one by Speaker Clark.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Read the balance of the sentence.

Mr. SNELL. That is not in point here.

There is also a decision by Speaker Clark along the same line, which I will put in later, because I cannot turn to them at the present time; but I want the Speaker to understand that I am making the point of order that the provisions of this rule are not in conformity with the philosophy of the rules of the House, do not carry out intent and purpose of the rules, and are directly opposed to the precedents, the decisions, and practices of this House.

#### RULINGS BY SPEAKERS CLARK AND CANNON

Where a special order provided for the appointment of conferees "without any intervening motion", it was held to exclude the motion to instruct conferees, but not the motion to recommit.

On August 15, 1912 (62d Cong., 2d sess., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 11042) the House agreed to a resolution making it in order to take the post office appropriation bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. It was further provided that on the adoption of the resolution the Speaker should appoint conferees "without any intervening motion."

Mr. Mann moved to commit the bill to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the recommendation that Senate amendment no. 118 be agreed to.

Mr. John A. Moon, of Tennessee, made the point of order that the special order by which the bill was taken from the Speaker's

table prevented the submission of intervening motions, including the motion to recommit, and demanded the previous question.

The Speaker read the last sentence of section 1, rule XVII, and decided (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 11089) that the special order could not abrogate this provision, and recognized Mr. Mann to offer the motion to recommit. (Cannon's Precedents, vol. 6, sec. 7950.)

A special order to lay before the House a bill on the Speaker's table with the previous question ordered on a motion to concur in Senate amendments, does not prevent submission of a motion to recommit.

On March 4, 1911 (61st Cong., 3d sess., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4332), Mr. John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution:

"Resolved, That when the bill (H.R. 32010), 'An act to create a tariff board,' shall have been received from the Senate the Speaker shall immediately, without regard to pending business, lay it before the House, and thereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on a motion to concur in the Senate amendments in gross."

Mr. Fitzgerald moved to commit the Senate amendments to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. James R. Mann, of Illinois, raised a question of order and contended that the special order just adopted precluded the motion to commit.

The Speaker overruled the point of order. (Cannon's Precedents, vol. 6, sec. 7892.)

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the Chair will permit, I desire to be heard for just a moment to point out that the gentleman from New York, the minority leader, read only a portion of the decision by Speaker Gillett.

Mr. SNELL. The other part did not have reference to this question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. This is what the minority leader read:

The Committee on Rules cannot report a rule which is aimed strictly or directly at overthrowing Calendar Wednesday or the motion to recommit,—

The gentleman from New York stopped at the comma there and did not read the rest of the sentence in that decision, which I now want to call to the attention of the Speaker:

but this does not prevent the Committee from reporting a resolution couched in general terms which may directly ban that ultimate result, such as a resolution providing for 6 days' suspension of the rules.

[Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. That has no reference to the question. Wait a minute, and do not holla too soon, and do not give the rebel yell, for it is bad precedent in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a darned good yell.

Mr. SNELL. It probably was 75 years ago, but it is not today, and it is poor form to raise it here.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, do I still have the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama has been recognized.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield to me so that I may answer the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will not interject any outside remarks.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman will control the Members on his side I will endeavor to do so on my own side, but we are not going to allow the rebel yell and not reply.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I submit that the gentleman from Alabama does not have the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yielded to the gentleman from New York and not to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Alabama does not have the floor on a point of order, and the gentleman from New York has the floor by recognition of the Chair on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. I simply want to say in reply to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has said that the reference he read referred to rules suspending the rules during the last few days of the regular session, and the point I make is that it is not in order to bring in a rule which directly or indirectly keeps the minority from offering the usual motion to recommit.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, may I say just a word on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MAPES. I have as much respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Alabama on points of order and interpretations of the rules of the House as any other Member of the House, but I should like to submit to the Speaker that the gentleman's interpretation of this rule is not necessarily binding upon the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows that. That is not a point of order.

The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. MAPES. If the Chair is ready to rule—

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not need such instructions.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I was only saying that preliminary to what I intended to say about the rule, and I thought it was pertinent.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. MAPES. I thought it was pertinent to what I was going to say about the rule, but if the Speaker does not care to hear me, that is all right.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will be pleased to hear the gentleman discuss the point of order.

Mr. MAPES. I was about to say I did not feel that the interpretation of the gentleman from Alabama of this rule was either correct or binding upon the Speaker; but if the Speaker accepts the interpretation of the rule as given by the gentleman from Alabama as being correct, it seems to me that he must sustain the point of order as raised by the gentleman from New York; but, for myself, I do not agree with that interpretation.

The rules of the House of Representatives are very specific and definite about motions to recommit, and I submit to the Speaker that it is dangerous to hold that a rule like this, which makes no reference to the motion to recommit, repeals or does away with the rule giving the minority the right to make one motion to recommit.

Nothing is said in this rule about a motion to recommit. It says only that no amendment to title II of the bill can be made except upon motion made by the Committee on Appropriations, and it is reading more into this rule than the language itself contains for the Speaker or for the gentleman from Alabama to say that it prevents the usual motion to recommit. The rules of the House are so sensitive in sustaining the right to make a motion to recommit in the regular way that it seems to me the Chair would not be justified in holding that a rule of this kind repeals or nullifies the standing rule with respect to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the Committee on Rules has reported out a resolution which violates the provisions of clause 45, rule XI, which are as follows:

The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order . . . which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in clause 4, rule XVI.

The pertinent language of clause 4, rule XVI is as follows:

After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution one motion to recommit shall be in order and the Speaker shall give preference in recognition for such purpose to a Member who is opposed to the bill or resolution.

The special rule, House Resolution 217, now before the House, does not mention the motion to recommit. Therefore, any motion to recommit would be made under the general rules of the House. The contention of the gentleman from New York that this special rule deprives the minority of the right to make a motion to recommit is, therefore, obviously not well taken. The right to offer a motion to recommit is provided for in the general rules of the House, and since no mention is made in the special rule now before the House it naturally follows that the motion would be in order.



A question may present itself later when a motion to recommit with instructions is made on the bill H.R. 6663 that the special rule which is now before the House may prevent a motion to recommit with instructions which would be in conflict with the provisions of the special rule. It has been held on numerous occasions that a motion to recommit with instructions may not propose as instructions anything that might not be proposed directly as an amendment. Of course, inasmuch as the special rule prohibits amendments to title II of the bill H.R. 6663 it would not be in order after the adoption of the special rule to move to recommit the bill with instructions to incorporate an amendment in title II of the bill. The Chair, therefore, holds that the motion to recommit, as provided in clause 4, rule XVI, has been reserved to the minority and that insofar as such rule is concerned the special rule before the House does not deprive the minority of the right to make a simple motion to recommit. The Chair thinks, however, that a motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate a provision which would be in violation of the special rule, House Resolution 217, would not be in order. For the reasons stated, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Will the Chair allow me to make a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. Do I understand from the ruling of the Chair the minority will be allowed to offer the usual motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The usual simple motion to recommit provided by the rules.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, as much as I dislike to do it, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. SNELL. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 260, nays 112, answered "present" 4, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—260

Adair	Clark, N.C.	Fulmer	Lanzetta
Adams	Cochran, Mo.	Gambrill	Larrabee
Allgood	Coffin	Gavagan	Lea, Calif.
Arnold	Colden	Gillespie	Lehr
Auf der Heide	Cole	Gillette	Lewis, Colo.
Ayers, Mont.	Collins, Miss.	Glover	Lindsay
Ayres, Kans.	Colmer	Goldsborough	Lloyd
Bailey	Cooper, Tenn.	Granfield	Lozier
Bankhead	Cox	Gray	Ludlow
Beam	Cravens	Greenwood	McCarthy
Beiter	Crosby	Gregory	McClintic
Berlin	Cross, Tex.	Griffin	McCormack
Biermann	Crosser, Ohio	Griswold	McDuffie
Black	Crowe	Haines	McFarlane
Bland	Cullen	Hamilton	McGrath
Blanton	Darden	Hancock, N.C.	McKeown
Bloom	Dear	Harlan	McMillan
Boehne	Deen	Harter	McReynolds
Boland	Delaney	Hastings	McSwain
Boylan	DeRouen	Healey	McLain
Brennan	Dickinson	Henney	Martin, Colo.
Brooks	Dickstein	Hill, Ala.	Martin, Oreg.
Brown, Ga.	Dies	Hill, Knute	May
Browning	Disney	Hill, Samuel B.	Miller
Brunner	Dobbins	Howard	Milligan
Buchanan	Dockweiler	Huddleston	Mitchell
Buck	Doughton, N.C.	Hughes	Monaghan, Mont.
Bulwinkle	Doxey	Imhoff	Montague
Burch	Drewry	Jacobsen	Montet
Burke, Calif.	Driver	Jeffers	Moran
Burke, Nebr.	Duffey	Jenckes, Ind.	Morehead
Busby	Duncan, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Murdock
Byrns	Durgan, Ind.	Johnson, Tex.	Musselwhite
Cady	Eagle	Johnson, W.Va.	Nesbit
Caldwell	Edmiston	Jones	Norton
Cannon, Mo.	Eicher	Keller	O'Brien
Carden, Ky.	Elzey, Miss.	Kelly, Ill.	O'Connell
Carmichael	Faddis	Kenney	O'Connor
Carpenter, Kans.	Farley	Kerr	Oliver, Ala.
Carpenter, Nebr.	Fiesinger	Kleberg	Oliver, N.Y.
Cartwright	Fitzgibbons	Kloeb	Owen
Cary	Fitzpatrick	Kocalkowski	Parker
Castellow	Flannagan	Kopplemann	Parks
Celler	Fletcher	Kramer	Parsons
Chapman	Ford	Lambeth	Patman
Chavez	Frey	Lamneck	Peterson
Church	Fuller	Lanham	Pettengill

Peyser	Sandlin	Strong, Tex.	Utterback
Pierce	Schaefer	Studley	Vinson, Ga.
Polk	Schuetz	Sullivan	Vinson, Ky.
Pou	Schulte	Sumners, Tex.	Walter
Ramspeck	Scrugham	Sutphin	Warren
Randolph	Sears	Swank	Wearin
Rankin	Secrest	Tarver	Weaver
Rayburn	Shallenberger	Taylor, Colo.	West, Ohio
Reilly	Shannon	Taylor, S.C.	West, Tex.
Richards	Sirovich	Terrell, Tex.	White
Richardson	Sisson	Thom	Whittington
Robertson	Smith, Va.	Thomason	Wilcox
Robinson	Smith, Wash.	Thompson, Ill.	Willford
Rogers, N.H.	Smith, W.Va.	Thompson, Tex.	Williams
Rogers, Okla.	Snyder	Truax	Wilson
Rudd	Somers, N.Y.	Turner	Wood, Ga.
Ruffin	Spence	Umstead	Woodrum
Sanders	Steagall	Underwood	Young

NAYS—112

Allen	Darrow	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N.Y.
Andrews, N.Y.	De Priest	Johnson, Minn.	Rich
Arens	Dirksen	Kahn	Rogers, Mass.
Bacharach	Ditter	Kelly, Pa.	Seger
Bacon	Dondero	Kinzer	Simpson
Bakewell	Doutrich, Pa.	Knutson	Sinclair
Beck	Dowell	Kurtz	Snell
Beedy	Eaton	Kvale	Stokes
Blanchard	Eltse, Calif.	Lambertson	Strong, Pa.
Boileau	Englebright	Lemke	Swick
Bolton	Evans	Lesinski	Taber
Britten	Fish	Luce	Taylor, Tenn.
Brumm	Focht	Lundeen	Tobey
Buckbee	Foss	McFadden	Traeger
Burnham	Frear	McGugin	Treadway
Carter, Calif.	Gifford	McLean	Turpin
Carter, Wyo.	Gilchrist	Mapes	Waldron
Cavicchia	Goodwin	Marshall	Wallgren
Chase	Goss	Martin, Mass.	Weideman
Christianson	Guyer	Meeks	Whitley
Clarke, N.Y.	Hancock, N.Y.	Merritt	Wigglesworth
Cochran, Pa.	Hartley	Millard	Withrow
Collins, Calif.	Higgins	Mott	Wolcott
Connery	Hoepfel	O'Malley	Wolfenden
Connolly	Holmes	Peavey	Wolverton
Cooper, Ohio	Hooper	Powers	Wood, Mo.
Crowther	Hope	Ransley	Woodruff
Culkin	James	Reece	Zioncheck

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Claiborne	Condon	Dunn	Maloney, Conn.
-----------	--------	------	----------------

NOT VOTING—54

Abernethy	Foulkes	Lehlbach	Sabath
Andrew, Mass.	Gasque	Lewis, Md.	Sadowski
Brown, Ky.	Green	McLeod	Shoemaker
Brown, Mich.	Greenway	Maloney, La.	Stalker
Cannon, Wis.	Hart	Mansfield	Stubbs
Carley, N.Y.	Hess	Mead	Sweeney
Corning	Hildebrandt	Moynihan, Ill.	Terry, Ark.
Crump	Hoidale	Muldorney	Thurston
Cummings	Hollister	Palmisano	Tinkham
Dingell	Kee	Perkins	Wadsworth
Douglass	Kennedy, Md.	Prall	Welch
Edmonds	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ramsay	Werner
Ellenbogen	Kniffin	Reid, Ill.	
Fernandez	Lee, Mo.	Romjue	

So the decision of the Chair was sustained as the judgment of the House.

The following pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. Mansfield (for) with Mr. Wadsworth (against).  
Mr. Carley of New York (for) with Mr. Muldowney (against).  
Mr. Mead (for) with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts (against).  
Mr. Douglass (for) with Mr. Hess (against).  
Mr. Sweeney (for) with Mr. Edmonds (against).  
Mr. Kniffin (for) with Mr. Hollister (against).  
Mr. Prall (for) with Mr. Lehlbach (against).  
Mr. Crump (for) with Mr. Welch (against).  
Mr. Green (for) with Mr. McLeod (against).  
Mr. Gasque (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Perkins.  
Mr. Hart with Mr. Moynihan of Illinois.  
Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Thurston.  
Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Stalker.  
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Tinkham.  
Mr. Brown of Kentucky with Mr. Shoemaker.  
Mr. Maloney of Louisiana with Mr. Stubbs.  
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Hoidale.  
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Brown of Michigan.  
Mr. Warner with Mr. Cummings.  
Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Kee.  
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Terry of Arkansas.  
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Lee of Missouri.  
Mr. Hildebrandt with Mr. Dingell.  
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Foulkes.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. STUBBS, is ill, but desires me to say that if he were present he would vote "aye."

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. SWEENEY, is unavoidably detained at home, but if present he would vote "aye."

Mr. WEST of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. KNIFFIN, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. LEHR. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HART, is absent on governmental business.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have a telegram read at the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALEXANDRIA, VA., January 11, 1934.

Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

House of Representatives:

Am in hospital and unable to attend Congress. Please have me paired to support the President on all matters.

J. J. MANSFIELD.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6131. An act to raise revenue by taxing certain intoxicating liquors, and for other purposes.

#### RULE FOR CONSIDERATION OF INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1935

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] while I make a request for unanimous consent. The usual limit for the discussion of a resolution from the Committee on Rules is 1 hour; but, in view of the fact that it is probable that the main issues involved in this controversy could legitimately be discussed in the consideration of the rule, we have had a tacit agreement with the minority members of the committee that debate may extend for 3 hours, to be confined to the resolution. In view of that agreement, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the time for the discussion of the resolution now pending be confined to 3 hours, one half of which shall be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] and one half by myself, and that at the conclusion of the 3 hours the previous question on the resolution shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. RANSLEY. Debate to be confined to the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate upon the resolution be confined to 3 hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] and one half by himself, at the conclusion of which time the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask whether those on the Democratic side who may not be in favor of the rule will be given some time from the control on the Democratic side?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I say very candidly to the gentleman that I have requests for more time than I can dispose of now from those who are in favor of the resolution.

Mr. O'MALLEY. In other words, we will have to go to the other side to get a chance to record our opinion of the rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under the circumstances I regret to say that I think that will be necessary.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Do I understand that no one who is opposed to this rule has asked the gentleman from Alabama for time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did have requests from two or three Members on this side who asked for time in the discussion of the rule. Those on this side generally are in the affirmative for the passage of this rule.

Mr. CONNERY. But the gentleman had requests from no one who is against it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Those on the other side control the time on that side, for those who are opposed to the rule. There are several members of the Committee on Rules who ordinarily are entitled to the privilege of speaking, and in

view of the peculiar nature of this question most of the time in the discussion of this rule will be allotted to the members of the Committee on Appropriations. I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] that that conclusion has not been reached as a matter of discourtesy or as a penalty to any Members on this side of the aisle who may be opposed to the rule, but I think it is consistent probably with the situation which confronts us.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Those of us on this side of the House are perfectly agreeable to the division of the time of an hour and a half on a side, but on the matter of the previous question being considered as ordered there cannot be an agreement so far as that is concerned.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. SNELL. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he modify his request and put it without the previous question. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects to the previous question portion of the request, although he does make the request that debate shall be confined to the bill as well as the rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows and as the gentleman from New York well knows, of course we would have only 1 hour for the discussion of this rule.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that, but as the gentleman from Alabama says, this is the crux of the whole matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We wanted to accommodate the opposition by some liberality of debate.

Mr. SNELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does that mean that debate will be limited to the bill as well as the rule?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It will be limited to the resolution, and, of course, that would permit discussion of the merits of the bill itself. Does the gentleman object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RANSLEY. I object to the previous-question portion of it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That means that the gentleman objects to the request.

Mr. RANSLEY. Then I shall have to object to that.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I modify the request, and ask unanimous consent that the debate on the resolution be confined to 3 hours, one half of which shall be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and one half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate extend for 3 hours, one half to be controlled by himself and one half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY]. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The original request was that the debate shall be confined to the bill or the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Debate to be confined to the bill or the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I asked for 3 minutes to discuss this rule, and I was not given that privilege. Therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Georgia objects. Of course I have no control over his conclusions at all, but I ask the gentleman to consider the situation, that by making his objection he is cutting off 2 hours of general debate upon the merits of the resolution.

Mr. O'MALLEY. What particular advantage is it to discuss it for 2 hours more?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], Chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be permitted to make a very brief statement without interruption. On March 4, 1933, the President of the United States took the oath of office. When the President of the United States took that



oath of office at that time, he found the country had descended to the lowest point, economically speaking, in all its history. He immediately set to work to present to the country a program which he hoped would have beneficial results. During the last session of Congress, time and again, we passed through this House resolutions from the Committee on Rules, which had for their purpose the putting through of his program.

This rule which the House is now being called upon to consider cuts off all amendments from title II of the bill, waives all points of order, and for its effect requires of the House either a vote up or down of the entire title II. Title II is a part of the program of the President of the United States. It has often been designated as the heart of his program. Speaking for myself, I shall not undertake to fire a shot at the program of my own President by even offering to amend title II.

The Committee on Appropriations is asking for this resolution. It is the hope of the administration, so I am informed, that the House will sustain the request of the Committee on Appropriations. We might as well face the issue here and now. Franklin Roosevelt's program has already produced vast results throughout the Nation. A blind man can see that there has been a tremendous improvement since March 4.

So far as I am concerned, I have no apology to make for supporting this rule. It is a simple test, as to whether or not we are going to hold up the hands of our great President. He is asking that his program, which was partially put in effect during the special session of Congress, be continued by virtue of the action of the House on this resolution.

I have supported the program of a number of Presidents, if you will pardon a concluding personal word. I supported Theodore Roosevelt in his naval program; I supported Woodrow Wilson, the great. I am winding up 33 years, gentlemen, a good long time. My brethren of the House of Representatives, I say to you here and now, that never during those 33 years have I supported any policy of any man with as much enthusiasm and as much satisfaction as I now support that of Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the Republican leader, Mr. SNELL.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no controversy with the statement made by my distinguished friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. I understood that the majority would support the President, but my contention has been so far here today—and I want to reiterate it—that I demand you support the President in accordance with the rules and precedents of the House of Representatives. [Applause.] You have evidently decided not to follow those rules or precedents, as a result of sustaining the decision handed down by the distinguished Speaker of this House, which, although I dislike to say it, is the most unfair, the most ruthless decision that has been handed down since I have been a Member of this Congress, and that has been 20 years.

On the morning of December 21 I was very pleased to read in the Washington Post, in large headlines, the following:

BYRNS OPENS MOVE TO JUNK HOUSE GAG—DEMOCRATS ENLIST G.O.P. AID TO END TACTICS OF LAST SESSION

House Democratic leaders are planning to junk unprecedented gag-rule procedure employed to rush the President's emergency program through the last session of Congress.

Relying on scattered Republican pledges of "cooperation" and a safe Democratic majority, House Democratic strategists hope to abandon "legislation by rule" at the January term, discarding the great body of gag precedents built up last spring.

In large headlines the following:

WILL NOT NEED RULE

"In the first place, I don't think we will need the special rules we were forced to bring out last session", Representative JOSEPH W. BYRNS (Democrat), of Tennessee, said last night.

"In the second place—

I want you people on the majority side to get this—

"I don't approve of the principle and never did."

[Applause.]

I was still further pleased to read in the Washington Post on the morning of December 26, 1933, the following:

HOUSE LEADER PLANS SUPPLY BILL REFORM—BUCHANAN HITS PRACTICE OF TACKLING LAWS ON APPROPRIATIONS—DEMOCRATS EXPECT MORE SPEEDY ACTION WITH SIMPLER PROCEDURE

Reforms in House procedure on the 11 big appropriation bills, limiting the supply measures more strictly to the original purpose of providing funds for the operations of the Government, will be sought this session by House Democratic leaders.

Representative JAMES P. BUCHANAN (Democrat) Texas, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, told the Post last night he hopes to eliminate the previous practice of writing general legislation into appropriation bills to expedite the passage through both Houses.

"Only where the White House specifically asks that legislation be handled in this manner will we use the supply bills for legislative purposes", Chairman BUCHANAN said.

"Appropriation bills should be regarded altogether as supply measures. In recent years we have been using them too broadly for legislation. I intend to stop the practice if I can."

That is the statement that the Democratic leaders of this House gave to the country at large 2 weeks before the session met.

When I read that statement in the paper, I made up my mind that I was about in the same position as a poor half-breed, pack-basket lumberjack man up in my country in the spring of the year. The man that I especially have in mind was Napoleon Lavine. They always called him "Old Pete." One day I met Old Pete in the road after he had been down to settle up for his winter work. I said to Pete, "Well, Pete, how did you get along?" He said, "Mr. SNELL, I tell you the truth. When I go down and go into that store, Billy Hartman's store, what you think? Billy Hartman was right behind the door. He say to me, 'Good morning, Napoleon.'" He said, "I know damn well when he call me Napoleon he going to skin me." [Laughter.]

I knew mighty well when I saw the statement of the majority leaders of how generous and how liberal and fair they were going to be in considering legislation this session they were getting ready to skin me, and they have started by the first bill that has been presented to the House.

Now, I have never been opposed to special rules, on certain occasions they are justifiable and I have probably brought more of them into this House than any present Member, but I have always considered there was a responsibility on the Rules Committee to be fairly fair with the House; just fairly fair. [Laughter.]

I say without hesitation, and I do not think any man on the majority side will deny the statement, that this is the most vicious, the most far-reaching special rule that has ever been brought on the floor of the American Congress. [Applause.] I admit that is a pretty broad statement.

If any man can show me where any majority ever dared bring in a rule to the House that not only hog-tied and prohibited the Members from expressing themselves on the legislation in hand but even extended through the entire session of Congress and all future appropriation bills for the entire Congress, I want him to tell me when it was done. Of course, I know why you are doing it. You think it is easier to hog-tie your own men today than it will be after we have been in session for 5 months. [Applause.] We tripped you up a couple of times the latter end of the last session because your own men were getting ashamed of you. You were ashamed of it yourselves. If you had not been, your leaders would never have given those interviews to the papers.

Another thing absolutely sure is that the majority leaders of the House either have no faith in the merits of the legislation presented today or have no confidence in the intelligence, the integrity, or the ability of their own Members to pass this legislation on its real merits. [Applause.]

Notwithstanding the statement of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, this present bill carries more legislation than any average appropriation bill, and it is very vital, important legislation; it is legislation that affects the



jurisdiction of a great many of the committees of this House. If we are going to start this way, what on earth is the use of forming committees? Why not simply say, "The Appropriations Committee and the President are going to do it all and we are going to abdicate absolutely all our rights as representatives of the people"? Are you real representatives of the people or just automatons?

One of the items in this bill about which I wish to talk is the authority given to heads of departments to create deficiencies. Ever since I have been here the policy of this Government has been decidedly and almost unanimously against the granting of any such authority; and I remember very well when the present majority leader was Chairman of the great Appropriations Committee—and he was a good chairman—he fairly raised the roof of this House talking about deficits on the part of executive departments, saying that never as long as he was in a position of authority would he agree to any such thing.

Why has he changed his position on the proposition at the present time?

There are two provisions in this bill whereby promotions are granted to the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps personnel, but denied to several other branches of the service.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that. We have raised them to an equal basis with the employees of the civil departments of the Government.

Mr. SNELL. Why did you not do it with all the rest of the departments?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We did.

Mr. SNELL. I do not so understand.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Read the bill again.

Mr. SNELL. It is impossible to tell what you intend to do because it is all covered up, and you will not tell us exactly what is intended by any of this language.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Doubtless the gentleman has not read the report of the committee, for it is very full on this question.

Mr. SNELL. It so happens the gentleman has read the report of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Read it again.

Mr. SNELL. Another very important matter is the pay of the civil-service employees. I was one of the Members of this House who last spring voted for the present economy measure. I did it with the understanding that it was going to be the policy of this administration to balance the Budget and cut down expenditures so they would somewhere near equal the income of the Government. Referring to the argument in favor of the Economy Act at that time, I find that the President said in his message, taking particular pains to point it out, that during the previous 3 years of Republican rule there had been a deficit of \$4,134,000,000. He affirmed that this continued deficit running over a period of 3 years had contributed to the collapse of our banking system, accentuated the stagnation of the economic life, and had added to the ranks of the unemployed. He went on further to warn Congress that upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rested the safety of bank deposits, the security of insurance policies and the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of agricultural products, and the availability of employment. Continuing, he said:

I give you assurance that if this is done, there is reasonable prospect that within a year the income of the Government will be sufficient to cover the expenditures.

On that basis, on that policy, a great many Members voted for the Economy Act. But within 60 days after the President received that authority and made that statement, the present administration commenced to spend the money in a more profligate manner than any administration in the history of this Government. [Applause.] But, in addition to that, the President comes before Congress 10 months after he made his first statement and frankly says that he expects that at the end of the first fiscal year of his administration there will be a deficit of \$7,309,000,000.

Now, in the face of this attitude, in the face of the absolute recklessness with which we are shoveling money out of the Treasury, what reason is there to further take the \$5 or the \$10 a month from the civil-service employees, the old widows, or the service-connected disability cases of the World War or Spanish War veterans? [Applause.]

I for one am willing to meet each one of these issues on its merits. If you gentlemen are as liberal as you claim to be, you will give us the opportunity of meeting these issues on their merits, and you will vote down the previous question on this rule and give this House the right to consider this legislation on its merits and the way it ought to be considered. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I brought all these documents and data here in the expectation there would be 3 hours of debate on this rule. Since there is to be but an hour of debate and my time is confined to 10 minutes, I shall touch some high spots only.

First I shall ask the Clerk to read this letter from the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: In my message transmitting to Congress the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, recommendation was made for the continuance during that fiscal year of certain economy legislative provisions. With regard to the continuance of the provision prohibiting automatic increases in compensation, recommendation was made that the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps be excepted from the restrictions thereof, commencing with July 1, 1934.

Upon further consideration of this matter I feel that if the six services mentioned in the Pay Adjustment Act of 1922 are given privileges of promotion comparable to those conferred upon civilian employees it will place the entire Federal service on a more uniform basis. Existing law permits of the advancement of a civilian employee of a lower grade to fill a vacancy in a higher grade, with an increase of compensation if his rate of pay is less than the minimum provided for the higher grade.

If the same principle be applied to the six services mentioned in the Pay Adjustment Act of 1922, I believe that such action would place all services on a more comparable basis and remove many of the inequalities.

I hope the Congress will enact the legislative economy provisions referred to in my Budget message as changed by the recommendation contained in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HON. JAMES P. BUCHANAN,  
Chairman Appropriations Committee,  
House of Representatives.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk be allowed to read another letter from the President which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, January 9, 1934.

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: I am today signing an Executive order, which, in effect, maintains the 15-percent reduction in the compensation of officers and employees of the Government until June 30, 1934.

I have taken this action only after an exceedingly careful check up by the Department of Labor in relation to the cost of living during the past 6 months. As you know, the act of March 20, 1933, authorizes me to restore a portion of the 15-percent reduction only if the index figures rise to above 15 percent below the cost of living index for the base period.

I have had two careful examinations made. The first of these relates to the general cost of living and shows that it is still 21.1 percent below the index for the base period in the country as a whole. The other set of findings concerns the cost of living of Government employees in the District of Columbia. In this case the cost of living is 14.6 percent below the index for the base period.

May I call your attention to the fact that all of these figures are based on data obtained by Government employees themselves, and that every effort has been made to arrive at the truth. I know, also, that you will realize that the overwhelming majority of Federal employees are scattered throughout the United States. In a few cities it is undoubtedly true that the present cost of living is slightly higher than the 15-percent reduction of pay warrants. It is necessary, nevertheless, under the law, to take the average, as there is no provision for picking out special localities for differences in rates.



The action taken by me today will, I know, be of interest to your committee in connection with the appropriation bills. I have recommended a flat restoration of 5 percent, or one third of the 15-percent reduction, this restoration to apply to the next fiscal year. I have asked also for authority to restore such portion of the balance of 10 percent as may be warranted by a possible further increase in the cost of living. I hope that your committee will go along with these suggestions. The problem of returning as quickly as possible to a balanced Budget is involved. To undo the excellent results of the Economy Act of last spring would be unfortunate for the very simple reason that we are very definitely still in an emergency period, in which all of us are seeking to bring back recovery as quickly as possible.

I shall, of course, be glad to talk with you and the members of your committee at any time.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

HON. JAMES P. BUCHANAN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield a moment for me to submit a request?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my request in reference to extension of debate on this matter. I do not know that it will do any good. However, I feel sure there are a great many Members here who would like to see this matter fully discussed. I therefore renew my request that the time for debate on the rule be extended to 3 hours, one half of the time to be controlled by myself and one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that time for debate on the rule be extended to 3 hours, one half to be controlled by himself and one half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY]. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, immediately after the House convened today I asked the gentleman from Alabama if he would allot me 3 minutes of the 3 hours' time set apart for a discussion of this special rule in order that I might explain my position with reference to it. I stated at the time that if the Democratic Members of the House had had a caucus and if I had been given the opportunity to recuse myself on account of certain pledges I have made to my constituents, I would not need to explain my vote, but that it was going to be necessary for me to make some kind of an explanation as to why I purpose to vote against this rule today. I consider now that I have had the opportunity of explaining my vote, and I certainly do not wish to limit the debate.

Mr. RANSLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I shall be glad to give him time. I will yield him 3 minutes.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I am not required to go to the other side of the aisle and ask for time. I say now that the reason I am going to vote against this rule is because I have made some definite pledges to my constituents, especially to the American Legion, Spanish-American War veterans and their widows, and to certain postal employees. I cannot vote for this rule without indirectly, at least, violating these pledges. For these reasons I objected to the gentleman's unanimous-consent request. Since I have been given the privilege of making this statement, I now withdraw my objection.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to know from the gentleman in charge of the time if it would be possible to obtain 3 minutes from the Democratic side instead of being forced to go to the Republican side and ask for time to speak against this rule?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am always willing to bargain a little.

Mr. O'MALLEY. That is why I am making the request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will trade with the gentleman.

Mr. CONNERY. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will state to the gentleman that I make only one trade a day.

Mr. CONNERY. I should like to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I am not trying to make a trade. I merely want to say that I have time from the Republican side—and I do not care what side it comes from when it is time to fight for the veterans and Government employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas 30 minutes, or so much thereof as the gentleman desires to use.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There seems to be some misapprehension on the part of certain Members of the House as to the effect of this rule and this legislation on veterans' bills that we hope to pass at this session of Congress. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not this rule would have any effect whatever on legislation reported out from the Veterans' Committee and passed on subsequently in the House?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It will have no effect on any bill voted out by the Veterans' Committee. Neither will it have any effect on any amendment to this appropriation bill or any other appropriation bill that comes before this House on World War or Spanish-American War pensions. In other words, there is nothing in the rule and there is nothing in this legislation that will make out of order any amendment to increase the compensation of World War or Spanish-American War veterans in this bill or any other appropriation bill, if the amendment be otherwise in order under the general rules.

Mr. RANKIN. If a veterans' bill should be reported out by the Veterans' Committee at this session of Congress, then, as I understand it, the appropriation for it could be taken care of in a deficiency bill later on?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Absolutely.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas to be of the opinion and state that if this rule should be adopted, and I, as a friend of the veterans and Federal employees, should offer an amendment to the legislative provisions of the bill, said amendment, if it provided an increase in pay or compensation would be in order without a rule from the committee?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The legislative provision of the bill does not relate in any respect to the compensation of World War or Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. MAY. Does it apply to civilian employees of the Federal Government?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It applies to Federal employees of the Government, but as employees and not as war veterans.

Mr. GOSS. If the rule is adopted, it will mean a 10-percent cut to the widows of Civil War veterans, will it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The current law provides for a 10-percent cut during the present year. This legislation carries forward the 10 percent into next year, with a modifying provision that if the cost of living goes up, as found by the survey made by direction of the President, the 10 percent is to be further reduced.

Mr. GOSS. But, otherwise, that would go off automatically June 30 next.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; it would go off automatically June 30 next, as would all these other economy provisions that are proposed to be renewed in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me now discuss for a short while the attitude of the administration toward this amendment.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the Republican leader, read an interview that I had with the Washington Post. The interview is reported correctly. I do not favor legislation on appropriation bills, and I am doing my best to keep such legislation out of appropriation bills; but, as the interview shows, I said in that interview, and I state now and here, that I make one exception to that rule. When legislation on an appropriation bill is requested by the President of the United States to carry out the great program for the relief of our country and when the President, whom the people have elected to bring such relief to the country, whom they have trusted,

and whom we have trusted and whom we are going to continue to trust, requests that legislation be placed on an appropriation bill so that he may take no chance on his recovery program not being carried forward, I am going to do my best to put it on there, and I have no apology to make to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] or anybody else. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman is willing to agree to the things that the President submits, and I have no doubt but what those things may be right, why does not the gentleman want to place some confidence in his own colleagues, and give them an opportunity to use their judgment in matters of this kind?

Mr. BUCHANAN. What confidence we place in our colleagues is none of the gentleman's concern. That is our business; and I may say that we have absolute confidence in our colleagues, and so far as the majority party of this House is concerned, the Democrats will take care of themselves and their own conferences without interference from the Republican side.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not talking politically; I am only talking for the good of the country in order that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to express themselves; and we might support the President's legislation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. To my Democratic colleagues let me say that the President requested this legislation in his Budget sent in here on January 4 last. We did not immediately accept that, because some Members thought that was written in there by the Director of the Budget and that the attention of the President might not have been called specifically to it. So your Speaker [Mr. RAINEY], your leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and myself at a conference at the White House discussed this identical subject. We discussed it fully, the President reviewed it and requested that it be placed on an appropriation bill and also requested that a rule be sought for its consideration.

Mr. MAY. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman, but I should like to get myself clear on one matter, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. All right; I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does this bill provide, in accordance with the President's request, as contained in his letters, that 5 percent of the 15 percent will be restored under the bill as of June 30 next?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It does.

Mr. MAY. And the other is a matter of future determination.

Mr. BUCHANAN. According to the cost of living; yes.

So even the request for a rule comes directly from the man who occupies the White House, who has the greatest combination of heart and mind of any President who ever graced that great office. [Applause.]

I am an administration man. I have absolute confidence in the success of this administration. I feel sure the President has the problems well in hand and is taking all reasonable steps and taking them intelligently in order to bring relief to our country.

Now, this is not new legislation. It is the continuance of legislation in effect during this present fiscal year through enactments of the last session of Congress. The President's entire Budget estimates are based upon a continuance of these legislative provisions during the next fiscal year. If they should be upset, then the whole Budget will be upset, and this Congress would have to increase the Budget \$170,000,000 over and above the Budget estimates.

Not only this, but if this program is defeated, it is a step backward by Congress in effecting economy and in bringing relief to the country. How do you know what effect it would have if it should go out to the country that Congress is not backing up the President and that Congress is repudiating the economy program which it adopted at the former session of Congress and was making vast appropri-

ations which the President had not recommended. Why, the psychological effect upon the country of such a course on our part might even interfere with the refinancing program that the President must accomplish if our country is to recover. The economy legislation contained in this bill is one of the cornerstones and one of the foundations upon which this entire recovery program is based and the President, in substance, so stated to us. Then they talk about defeating it.

Now, let us see what this measure does. There are 15 different classifications of savings affected by this economy legislation.

First, the general salary reduction of 10 percent, and not 15 percent as we provided this year. This causes an additional appropriation of \$63,000,000 which has been added to the Budget to take care of the restoration of the 5 percent.

That will save, if the cost of living does not rise, \$128,000,000.

The next is the prohibition against administrative promotions which will save \$3,264,000.

The prohibition against the filling of vacancies will save \$3,033,000.

The reduction in certain rates of postal travel, \$1,175,000.

Administrative furloughs will save \$12,000,000 this year and next year only \$2,000,000, because the personnel in the different departments has been decreased.

The following are other savings made during the next fiscal year by this legislation:

Reduction in the rural carriers' equipment allowance, \$9,660,000.

Reductions in jurors' and witnesses' per diems, \$868,198.

Reduction in permanent appropriations, \$2,943,144.

Suspension of reenlistment allowances in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, \$5,007,725.

Prohibition against increases in pay by reallocations of positions under the Classification Act, \$111,055.

Reduction in benefits payable through the Employees' Compensation Commission, \$353,333.

Reduction in pensions for wars prior to the Spanish-American War, \$7,300,000.

Reduction in pensions payable under private acts, \$191,600.

Suspension of automatic promotions, \$6,000,000.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. In 1928 the Republican organization under President Coolidge gave an increase of \$18,000,000 to the Federal employees in terms of \$60, \$120, and \$180 increase. Through the Federal Economy Act they have deprived them of \$175,000,000. Does the gentleman think that is just?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; it is just. Let me tell the gentleman why I think so. Those employed by the Government, particularly in these distressing times, are in a very favorable position compared with the many millions of our citizens who are unemployed, partially employed, or otherwise acutely suffering from depression conditions. The Government compensation, annual leave with pay, sick leave with pay, half-holiday leave with pay, regularity and assurance of pay, retirement benefits, and tenure protection, make public service attractive in normal times and doubly desirable—even with pay reduction—in times of wide-spread unemployment and economic and financial distress. Viewed as a group, our Federal employees are a fortunate part of our citizenship at present.

The Government wage is in excess of the wage of all other low-class employees in private industry, even with the 15-percent reduction.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does the gentleman realize that over 220,000 Federal employees receive less than a thousand dollars a year?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not realize that fact. I have a report that I requested from the Labor Department, and that report shows that the employees in private industry have been reduced 21 to 51 percent more than the Government employees.



Mr. SIROVICH. I have a report which shows that in the military and naval forces there are 2,320 receiving less than a thousand dollars a year.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I was not referring to the enlisted men of the Army or the Navy, who, in addition to their pay the gentleman has referred to, get their subsistence, quarters, clothing, and other perquisites.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman believe that an employee getting less than a thousand dollars should be cut the same amount as the man receiving high wages?

Mr. BUCHANAN. If I had my way, I might exempt from that deduction the low-salaried employees, but every man cannot have his own way in legislation. There must be compromise, and I am not one of those who is so darn stubborn that he believes he is right all the time and that the other fellow is wrong all the time.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Sixty percent of the employees in the Government receive less than \$2,000 and 125,000 receive less than \$1,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; and how many millions of citizens in the United States do not even receive \$50 a month or \$600 a year? And the gentleman is also referring in the \$1,000 group to a very large number of enlisted men in the Army and Navy, who, I have just said, get subsistence, quarters, clothing, and so forth, in addition to their cash compensation.

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman another question? The gentleman stated he thought a graduated pay cut would be better, and I agree with him. What would be the objection to voting down this rule and allowing us to make that provision in this law?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let me tell the gentleman something. I have no tolerance with any man, whether he be on the Democratic or Republican side, who stands up in this Chamber and opposes the recovery program of the President of the United States.

Mr. MOTT. I do not admit that that is opposing the recovery program.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I say it is.

Mr. MOTT. I am stating that it is a better way, and asking the gentleman if he does not agree with that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have told the gentleman my convictions upon that. I shall not yield any more, because there are many things I want to say. Let me tell the gentleman something else. The gentleman may or may not be one of those who did it, but there were 65 Republicans on that side of the House who voted for this identical legislation in the last extra session of Congress.

Mr. MOTT. And I venture to say that nine tenths of them are very sorry for it now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They may be sorry now they did it, because this immediately precedes an election year, but when the next election comes on, when our country shall have recovered, they will be very proud of it.

Mr. RICH. Is this a political quibble or is it something for the good of this country?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; the gentleman's side is making it one.

Mr. RICH. We thank the gentleman very much for that information.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is my judgment. Here is Mr. SNELL speaking when this identical legislation was before the House last spring. He said:

Mr. Speaker, what few words I say relative to the legislation before us at this time are not said either as a Republican or as a Democrat. They are said as a loyal American citizen, who desires to meet the duties that come to him as a Representative in this House.

As a loyal American citizen—not as a Republican, not as a Democrat! Your distinguished Republican leader says he makes them as a loyal American citizen. He supported and voted for this legislation at that time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Wait a minute. An election is coming on, and it has been one of the weaknesses or the strength of the Republican Party to appeal to organized minorities in the country.

Mr. TABER. But that bill did not carry a repeal of the antideficiency laws of this country.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It carried the same provisions that are embraced within this rule in title II of this bill.

Mr. TABER. But that provision was not in it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, the gentleman says it did not carry the little routine administrative provisions that authorize a department to incur a deficiency. They did not tell you how that was. They can incur a deficiency only if the cost of living goes up and a part of that 10-percent reduction is restored. They can incur that deficiency only on a specific order from the President specifying the amount, and it shall not be any greater than the exact sum necessary to pay the raise in the salary that he gives them. This opposition to that provision is all just a subterfuge, just an excuse these gentlemen are hunting up to attack this bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No one will undertake to base his objection to this particular provision that is now being discussed upon the ground stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of course not. I want to read a little more from the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let me finish with Mr. SNELL. You have in this bill a salary reduction of 10 percent. He was supporting a salary reduction of 15 percent in March last. Let us see what he said then:

Several months ago I took the floor and asked that responsibility for this kind of work be given to the then President of the United States. The Democratic majority did not all agree with me then; why, I do not know; but I have not changed my position one iota. I stand now as I stood then. If you are going to accomplish this purpose, you must put it up to the President of the United States and hold him responsible. This is not a time or place to review or discuss by-gones. . . .

Every part of this country is in a terrible situation and waiting for affirmative action by Congress. Every municipality, town, county, and State is cutting down its appropriations and cutting down salaries of its officials, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we must set the example here. We must put the Federal house in order first. That is the crux of the whole situation. It is up to you men to do your duty here today and give the President an opportunity to do the things that he says are absolutely necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat the speech of the majority leader, Mr. SNELL, to the Democratic membership of this House. It is up to you to give the President that legislation which constitutes an integral part of his recovery program, that he might proceed to accomplish the purposes he started out to accomplish. I could quote practically the same thing from my friend, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. He emphasized the fact that salaries ought to be cut by the Federal Government. Why then have they changed front in 9 months? In favor of the cut last March or April, against the cut now.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman been speaking about me? I have not changed my position on the right to cut, but I do not believe in a rule which permits the antideficiency laws to be repealed without a fair vote. I believe in going down the line just as I went before, notwithstanding the President has run out on us with this extravagance program that he has put across.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Now, one other thing. I know, as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that salaries in the regular Government departments and independent establishments are based on the schedules in the Classification Act. It came to my attention that in the emergency agencies, they were not based on that act, but they were paying higher salaries in some of those organizations. I im-



mediately wrote every one of those emergency organizations, and I immediately got in contact and conference with the President on that subject. I am glad to say that on November 18 the President issued an Executive order directing that the salaries be placed on pay schedules approximating those of the Classification Act, and that all of them sustain the 15-percent cut that was then in existence. More of these agencies have been organized since then. Just 3 days ago the President issued another Executive order which took within its scope every emergency agency now organized or hereafter to be organized, making them base their salaries upon the classification schedules, and subjecting them to whatever pay reduction the law requires.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with close attention to the 30-minute speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], who is chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I submit to you that he did not touch the merits of the question of continued slashing of the moderate wages of governmental workers.

He referred to Members on this side who voted for the so-called "Economy Act" of March 20, 1933, and argued that they should vote the same way today. The fact is that we embarked on a new and better policy through the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, and those who vote against this rule today are voting for the principles of that act. He urged all Members to follow the President, forgetting that it is unwise to attempt to follow in opposite directions at the same time.

For myself, while I voted against the original so-called "Economy Act" as one calculated to drag us deeper into depression, I yield to no one on this floor in earnest and enthusiastic support of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which is the key of the President's recovery program. I believe that measure to be the most fundamental, far-reaching, and forward-looking legislation enacted during my service in Congress.

That great measure is based on the philosophy that cooperation can and should be substituted for cut-throat competition in American industry and business. It provides a method for teamwork on the part of capital, labor, and the Government for the attainment of the supreme objective, increased purchasing power through increased wages. The President has appealed with all his splendid earnestness and eloquence to private employers of the land to increase their wage payments and shorten working hours so that the additional income will create orders for the products which factory and farm are eager to supply.

Here today we have a nullification project. Here is a program which runs counter to every principle of the recovery program. This announcement that Congress intends to continue the wage-cutting program into 1935, and reduce the purchasing power of faithful employees, is so inconsistent that it cannot be explained away. Little wonder that the supporters of this rule and the provisions it makes in order do not even make the attempt.

Mr. Speaker, if the recovery program to revive American business through increased wages and purchasing power is right, this wage-cutting program is wrong. Both cannot be right. I am convinced that the National Industrial Recovery Act is fundamentally sound and right. There has not been, and there is not now, any other way to emerge from the swamp of depression save through a restoration of buying power in the hands of Americans. Then, why do we not have faith enough and courage enough to follow the right course as to those workers for whose wage standards Congress is alone responsible?

I am frank to say that the N.R.A. has not proved its effectiveness as yet. The one weak point, which may prove fatal, is wage pay rolls as compared to price and production.

Sometime ago I asked the Research Division of the Federal Reserve Board to prepare a table for me showing the relation of price, production, and pay rolls in November 1933

as compared to the average for the year 1926, which by common agreement is the best year to serve as a standard for our recovery efforts.

The figures furnished were illuminating. Wholesale prices and industrial production were exactly balanced in November 1933. Employment, including all part-time employment, was a little more favorable than either prices or production. But pay rolls, the very key to success, because they embody the purchasing power which alone can sustain prices and production, were 16 points behind prices and production.

That gulf must be bridged or prices and production will collapse. The figures show that the N.R.A. has not sinned in the direction of too high wages but rather in the direction of too low wages. The codes must be revised upward as to wages and downward as to hours of labor.

What position is the Government in to take that necessary step while it cuts the wages of its own workers? Private employers know the present inconsistency. One of them from my own district said to me the other day, "The Government had better stop cutting wages itself before it asks us to increase wages." The best thing we can do here and now is to put the blue eagle over the post offices and every other place where employees labor for Uncle Sam. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to waste my time by denouncing this ruthless, utterly unjustifiable gag rule. It offends against the principles of representative government. Every Member who votes for it deliberately chooses to rob himself of rights which belong to his office and to prevent this House from acting as a deliberative, legislative body.

I want to address myself during this limited time to the provisions of law which this rule makes in order, and in effect enacts into law without real discussion or possibility of amendment.

First, it means a wage cut of 10 percent for every worker in the Government service, no matter how small may be his pay. I have on my desk a letter from an old and worthy constituent, who for 28 years has been a light attendant under the Bureau of Lighthouses. He looks after lights on the Monongahela River, and every evening and every morning, in winter and in summer, he crosses the river to look after his lights. His regular pay is \$12 a month—a month, not a week.

He writes me that under the Economy Act now in force he loses \$1.80 every month out of that pittance. He states that this cut is cruel, in view of the fact that he has no other income and is compelled to buy a boat every 3 years in order to perform his duties.

In the Postal Service, with which I am most familiar, there are about 30,000 apprentices, known as postal substitutes. They are essential to the conduct of the great Post Office Service. They are paid by the hour for the hours they work. They report at their various post offices every day for duty. For the last 2 years they have been able to secure only trifling employment, due to the fact that there are "floating" regulars who are used for the work which formerly went to the substitutes. Vacancies through death and retirement are not filled, thus shutting off the chance for appointment for the substitutes. These are not boys but men who have served years in the hope that some day they might secure a place in the regular service. Many of them are married, struggling to support their families on four or five dollars a week. Ten percent of their miserable pay will be deducted under this program for 1935. We have made a worthy attempt to end sweatshop wages in private industry. It might be well to end sweatshop wages under the flag of the United States, where Congress has the sole power and responsibility. [Applause.]

Let me quote the words of one of these substitutes in the Postal Service who is now facing the actual conditions which apply in many thousands of instances. He writes:

We have in this office at the present time 46 substitutes. Of this number 27 are married and 16 have children. Only three of us have no one dependent upon ourselves for support.

The senior substitute has 7 years and 2 months' service and the junior substitute has 4 years' service.

We have never been furloughed compulsorily, not because of consideration for us but simply to have us available in case of



emergency, there having been periods of 2 and 3 weeks when none of us have been employed a single hour.

We have received a total of \$175 in contributions, the proceeds of a fund collected by the regular employees, to provide relief for our destitute members. The regulars also absented themselves during March 1932 for 1 day without pay by permission of the local authorities, it being agreed that substitutes would be employed to replace them an equivalent number of hours.

Until several months ago we found it impossible to obtain relief from the charitable agencies due to our being regarded by them as having jobs. Despite the fact that we were to all practical purposes unemployed, however, after prolonged agitation, the Federal Relief Administrator interceded in our behalf and directed the local relief agencies to show no discrimination against us. As a result several men are now receiving aid.

The average substitute's age is 28 years. We all have borrowed to the limit. Should we receive regular appointments immediately it would take the majority of us several years to emerge from debt. Some of the men have lost their homes, and other have been dependent entirely on the charity of friends and relatives.

I know the argument is made that the lowered cost of living applies to these substitutes and other small-pay employees. Therefore, they should stand the pay reduction in the same percentage as the others. It is not an argument; it is sheer cruelty. When full pay even under the best of conditions means hardship and want, the reduction of a few dollars is an inhuman practice.

I am opposed to basing wages on solely a cost-of-living basis. That is the theory underlying these wage provisions. The President was given power to determine the cost of living during the first 6 months of 1928 and use that as a base period. Then he is to determine the difference in cost of living during each 6 months' period and compare it with the base period.

Already we have had three such determinations and each time the announcement has come that the cost of living has not yet reached a point which would permit an advance in pay. The last announcement was based on statistics which no Member of this House understands. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in promulgating the findings on which the President acted, made the following statement:

As a basis for this determination information was obtained on the expenditures of different types of Federal employees at both dates, through detailed schedules filled out in personal interview with employees whose names were chosen by lot, and through 2 questionnaires, 1 sent to all employees and 1 to a large sample of employees whose names likewise were chosen by lot.

From these data the quantity and the cost of different goods and services purchased by Federal employees in the first 6 months of 1928 have been ascertained. The cost of the same bill of goods and services in December 1933 has been computed, and index numbers have been calculated showing relative costs of the two periods. Prices have been collected which make it possible to calculate living costs in March 1933, but they have not yet been summarized.

Taking costs in the first 6 months of 1928 as 100, the index of the average cost of living for all Federal employees in the District for December 1933, was 85.4, showing a decline of 14.6 percent.

#### SEPARATE INDICES MADE

In addition to the index for all employees, separate indices have been computed for the families of 3 categories of employees—custodial, with salaries less than \$2,500; others with salaries below \$2,500, and those with salaries of \$2,500 or more. An index was also computed for single individuals living in rented rooms, of whom there are about 10,000. The indices for these groups are as follows:

- Custodial, with salaries less than \$2,500, 83.4 percent.
- Other employees with salaries less than \$2,500, 85.1 percent.
- Employees with salaries over \$2,500, 85 percent.
- Single individuals living in rented rooms, 88 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the practice of "casting lots" comes down from ancient times, but it ought to be possible to devise a better plan in 1934 for dealing with human problems which mean happiness or misery for Americans.

This whole cost-of-living theory is old and decrepit and should be laid beneath the sod. It is based on the belief that wages is that pay which will keep a worker alive and enable him to produce another worker to take his place. That theory would destroy all advancement and paralyze all progress. To say that a certain period in 1928 shall be the very maximum of achievement is unworthy from every standpoint.

Were the wages in that sacred period adequate to a decent American standard of living? They were not. At that time 124,000 Government employees out of a total of 700,000

received less than \$1,000 a year and 417,000 received less than \$2,000 a year.

Wages must not be fixed beyond chance of advancement. They must depend upon productivity and service. There must be an ever-increasing standard of living through increased income if this mass-production system is not to bury us all under the debris of an industrial order out of all control. The very heart and goal of the new deal must be the true deal of human advancement and growth.

There is another provision in these measures which it is sought here to reenact for 1935. That is the ban against promotions within the service. It means great additions to the pay cut for a great host of workers.

The President, in his Budget message, recognizes this injustice as far as it applies to the military services. He said:

Among the legislative provisions appended hereto is one prohibiting automatic increases in compensation except in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. The personnel of these three services are engaged in a life service to their country. Some, by reason of the pay freezes, have sustained reduction in compensation of more than 25 percent. They are, therefore, in a different category from those in other governmental agencies. They should, in 1935, be released from the restrictions on automatic increases in compensation.

He is right that the ban should be lifted on promotions in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. These promotions are part of the agreement when men enter these services, and they should be faithfully maintained. But exactly the same arguments, and with even greater force, apply to the civil-service employees. They, too, enter upon a life service. They, too, in many instances have suffered a loss of more than 25 percent of what they should receive.

Take the Railway Postal Service, an indispensable part of the job of getting mail from the sender to the addressee. The situation faced by a grade 2 terminal clerk is as follows:

Loss on promotion, fiscal year 1934.....	\$150.00
Loss on salary (15 percent).....	300.00
Loss on night differential (15 percent).....	30.00
Loss on payless furlough (first quarter).....	51.25
	<hr/> 531.25

Salary, \$2,000.

Percentage of loss, 26.56.

Grade 2 clerk assigned to road duty on June 30, 1933, due to be promoted to grade 3 July 1, 1933. Promotion lost under provisions of present Economy Act.

Loss on promotion, fiscal year 1934.....	\$150.00
Loss on salary (15 percent).....	300.00
Loss on night differential (15 percent), 1934.....	30.00
Loss on travel allowance (33 1/3 percent), 1934.....	87.00
Loss on payless furlough (first quarter 1934).....	51.25
	<hr/> 618.25

Salary, \$2,000.

Percentage of loss, 30.91.

Post-office clerks and letter carriers in the lower grades meet the same additional wage cuts, reducing their incomes by 25 percent and more in some cases.

The Appropriations Committee has modified the President's request so that the advances will apply between grades and not effect the longevity increases. At present vacancies in the captain rank can be filled by a lieutenant only through Executive order. The modified provision will permit this promotion in regular course and without Executive order. Exactly the same condition is found in the Postal Service. At present a post-office clerk cannot be given the pay of an assistant superintendent of mails without an Executive order. He may do the work, and in many cases he does, but he cannot be paid the salary which goes with the position. Is there any reason why this civil-service employee should not be placed on the same basis as the military-service employee? Yet the provisions which this rule will enact contain that unjustified discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, there are other features of this program which I have not time to describe. There are furloughs to hang over the head of every employee and to descend with deadly force upon many. There are reductions in travel allowances, even though the employee must pay this additional sum from his pay in the performance of his required duties.



The whole program is unsound and inhuman. It is not recovery medicine but depression poison. It was said at first that these drastic measures entailed hardships, but they must be endured for the sake of a balanced Budget and to maintain the credit of the United States. We heard that thundered forth last March, but it is expressed in a still small voice today. Then we saw a picture of a balanced Budget for next July 1. Now we are told that, although the wage cuts were made, the Budget will be out of balance by \$7,000,000,000!

We saved about \$135,000,000 by the 15-percent wage cut, and we spent \$341,000,000 for the civilian conservation camps. With that \$135,000,000 spent by Government workers, turning over and over in the channels of business, a large part of those in the conservation camps could have been occupied in normal employment.

Mr. Speaker, the National Budget will not be balanced until Americans get an opportunity to balance their own budgets on decent income levels. Purchasing power will create orders for idle factories and idle workers and nothing else will.

As to the credit of the Government, it should not be entirely forgotten that that word "credit" is used in connection with those who pay their just obligations. A miser may have great hoards of money, but if he will not pay his obligations he is not entitled to credit in business.

The Government has an obligation to maintain the wage standards fixed by laws enacted in regular procedure. They were part of the agreements made with workers when they entered the various departments and services. They were low in the best of times, but American citizens accepted them and the fact that they could never expect to win any high rewards in return for security of position and income. This understanding was not a legal contract and it cannot be enforced in a court of law. I maintain that it is a moral contract, and that the credit of the Government would be strengthened by keeping it.

The fact that private employers were forced to lower wages below any cut suffered by Government employees does not give warrant to governmental wage cuts. It simply proves that private business, dependent upon profits for existence, must take desperate measures even though they destroy general purchasing power and injure the community. The individual may be forced to do what should not be done in view of the public interest. The Government is under no such compulsion, for it can do those things which are for the common good and use its efforts to help bring those conditions where private business may do the same.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about figures and percentages but beyond them are lives and homes. Cutting a few dollars from small incomes means lack of shoes and clothing for school children, lost educational opportunities for young men and women. It means lapsed insurance policies, loss of homes because mortgage payments cannot be met. It means that the help given unemployed relatives is made impossible with consequent added burdens to relief and welfare agencies. It means privation and suffering in many forms.

Let us end such a policy and adopt the true recovery principle that increased wages and purchasing power alone can end this monstrous situation where all of us suffer because too much is produced. Let us end this wage reduction which takes income, not only from faithful and efficient Government workers but from American industry and trade and agriculture. Vote this rule down. Restore these wage levels to the very moderate standards set by Congress in orderly procedure. That is marching forward, not backward. It will bring encouragement to every worker in the land. It is a stride on the road to recovery. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my agreement, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume all of the 3 minutes. I merely want to call to the attention of the Members upon the Democratic side that in this rule we are asked to vote not only upon the proposition of giving help

to those who have been unjustly harmed by the Economy Act passed last spring but if the rule is voted it will prevent us during the rest of this session of the Seventy-third Congress from offering any amendments to any other appropriation bills that may come in here, even though we desire to right any wrongs caused by the Economy Act.

Personally, I do not want to vote to bind the Members of my party against doing anything they may want to do in the rest of this session to correct injustices that may have occurred in previous appropriation bills and injustices growing out of the Economy Act itself that was passed in the special session.

I shall vote against this rule because I do not want to force upon my colleagues a restriction upon their action in the future and because I do not want to force them into a position where they cannot do anything about any appropriation bills yet to come before us. [Applause.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on the rule may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, in Massachusetts recently I attended a reception given by postal workers. Three or four postmasters were there. I overheard two of them sitting next to me having a discussion as to whether they had remembered to put the blue eagle in the windows of their respective post offices or whether they had forgotten it. I was introduced to speak after I had heard this discussion, and I turned to these postmasters and said: "You gentlemen are all wrong on this proposition. The blue eagle is for concerns which have raised wages and shortened hours. The United States Government has cut wages and lengthened hours of its employees, so what you ought to have in your post offices, as well as in all other Government departments, is a black hawk. [Applause.] Let us hope you may soon be entitled to display the blue eagle, because the blue eagle represents higher wages and shorter hours, and let us hope that the Government will soon do away with the black eagle of long hours and cut wages. The United States Government should be consistent and place its own employees under the N.R.A."

If you Members of the House here today want to help labor, if you want to help the underpaid Government employee, if you want to help the World War veteran, the Spanish War veteran—37 suicides of Spanish War veterans took place in the State of Massachusetts alone within 3 months after the passage of the economy bill—if you want to help those veterans, the Civil War veterans, and all the underpaid people in the Government service, you will vote down this rule, because this is the first strategic move in the battle for the veterans and labor, and the first fight comes on this rule.

We have heard a lot about the cost of living not having gone up sufficiently to warrant the removal of the 15 percent cut on Government employees. I think such an argument is answered pretty fully in this speech delivered by Harry King, a department store owner and former head of the Washington Chamber of Commerce. These figures are now the confirmed and official figures of the Department of Labor. I shall read his statement from the Washington News:

LIVING COSTS ARE OUTDATED AS WHOLESALE PRICES RISE—PRESIDENT'S DETERMINATION WAS BASED ON RETAIL FIGURES, NOT YET AFFECTED BY N.R.A. BOOSTS IN MANUFACTURING EXPENSES

By C. A. F.

If there is any cheer to be drawn from the President's order for continuation of the full 15 percent Government cut until July 1, here it is: The cost-of-living basis for determining Government salaries is likely to be so thoroughly discredited before July 1 that the President and Congress will be convinced of the need for junking it.



The reasons for that statement were given in a public address not long ago by Harry King, department store owner and former head of the Washington Chamber of Commerce, and they are now confirmed by official figures of the Labor Department.

King said that when N.R.A. was being organized "every merchant knew that with increased costs for labor in manufacturing industries prices would rise. Every merchant went into the market and bought, at low prices, quantities of goods that would stock him for many months.

#### RETAILERS MUST FOLLOW

"The merchants", King continued, "sold this merchandise on the basis of what it cost them. But now most of it is sold. Hardly an item can be replaced by the merchant without paying 15 to 40 percent more and, in some cases, 100 percent more, to the manufacturer or jobber. Spring merchandise will be much higher to the consumer as well as to the retailer."

The Labor Department's confirmation is in its report of wholesale prices for the week ended December 30. It showed that since March 4 prices of all commodities have increased 19 percent. Farm products have gone up 40 percent; textile products, 50 percent; house furnishing goods, 11 percent.

#### WORKING OF N.R.A.

The 19-percent jump for all commodities is traceable to operation of the N.R.A. codes, which set minimum wages and also prohibit selling under cost. Labor Department officials agree these higher costs in manufacturing have not yet been reflected in prices to the consumer, but that they must show their effect when the retailers begin to sell their spring merchandise.

#### LAW SETS FIXED PATTERN

The Labor Department survey on which the President's continuation of the full 15 percent cut is based could not, under the law, take into account this changing factor. Nor could the President depart from the letter of the statute, which prescribes that average living costs for the 6 months just ended must be compared with the first 6 months of 1928.

Even the special survey conducted in Washington could not depart from the legal pattern. It could not consider the "human side", nor could it estimate the probabilities of the next few months. It had to be a statistical statement of what it cost to live (based on retail prices) in the last 6 months of 1933 as compared with exactly the same manner of living in the first 6 months of 1928.

#### NO CREDIT FOR DEFENDANTS

The law assumed that all persons lived exactly the same in 1933 as in 1928. The Labor Department survey has shown that is far from the truth. In particular, Government employees have many dependents they did not have in 1928. Most of them are unemployed relatives being supported wholly or largely by the people with steady jobs.

The law takes no account of them.

#### NEW LAW ONLY REMEDY

The only hope of a remedy lies in a revised law, for which many officials devoutly hope. The only way of getting a revised law is for Congress to enact it. Congress probably will not act unless the President recommends it. Congress cannot act at all after its adjournment, which most forecasters say will be well before July 1.

It comes down to this. It is all right to refer to statistics compiled by the Department of Labor, to show that the cost of living has not gone up. But 1928 and 1933 are very far apart as to living conditions. The Post Office employee and all of the Government workers, when they go into the grocery stores and into various retail establishments to buy merchandise, are not following the Department of Labor statistics. They are following the prices that they actually must pay that retail store.

The cost of living has gone up, and it is going up higher within the next few months. It seems to me totally inconsistent for the United States Government to take the stand it has in this matter. You will remember the principles we fought for in the Black-Connery 30-hour week bill, which eventuated into the N.I.R.A. during the last session. I am 100 percent for the principle of the N.I.R.A., but I believe that in justice to all industry in the United States and in justice to labor you will have to come to a 30-hour week, not to a 40-hour week, not a 35-hour week, not a 32-hour week. You will have to come to a 30-hour, 5-day week, 6-hour day if you want to put the people of the United States to work and really relieve the unemployment situation in industry.

In the 30-hour week bill we sought the right of collective bargaining, the abolition of child labor, the abolition of the "yellow dog" contract, and the right of labor to organize. We talk about minimum wages and shortening the hours of labor. The letter carrier who walks the street in front of your house sees men in the woolen mills, or factories, or whatever industry you may have in your district.

He sees his own wages cut down to the bone. He sees the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States saying to the manufacturer: "Bring up your wages. Shorten your hours." Then to his amazement he is told by the United States Government (although he, as a Government employee, should be used as an example by the Government to lead the way to industry in wages and hours under the banner of the N.R.A.): "We have cut your pay and we are going to keep down your wages instead of giving you the decent living wage which we insist your neighbors shall have." And remember, these Government employees did not get a decent living wage when times were good. They did not get a really decent living wage at any time. Remember, I am referring to all Government employees. I merely take the Postal Service as an example, because they are the ones with whom you most often come in personal contact. Many of them could have gone out into private industry and could have received five times the amount being paid them by the Government, on account of their brains and ability. But, due to loyalty to the United States Government over a long period of years when times were good they did not go to private industry and get the money to which they would be entitled. They stayed with the Government and were loyal to the United States, and for doing that we penalize them at this time by cutting their pay. I think it is all wrong.

Mr. SIROVICH. Does the gentleman realize that in our country we have starvation wages, living wages, and saving wages; starvation wages that starve the body and mind, living wages that keep body and soul barely together, and the time has come when the people have to save in times of affluence in order to take care of themselves in times of adversity.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from New York, my friend the distinguished doctor, is absolutely correct in his statement. We have passed the days when the country will stand for either starvation wages or mere living wages. The working people demand their place in the sun and will have it. The day of the saving wage is here, thanks to the courage, humanity, and statesmanship of President Roosevelt, who has given new hope to the exploited workers of industry in the country by his program for high wages, saving of homes and farms, and the N.I.R.A. But let us be consistent. Let us put the Government workers under the N.R.A. and make them proud to work for an Uncle Sam who brings them into the family fold of all self-respecting workers of the country and does not treat them like stepchildren to be driven out into the forests of despair to be devoured by the wolves of long hours and low wages.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNERY. In conclusion may I say: If you are for the worker and the veteran, vote down this rule. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

#### GAG RULE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of high wages. I have always voted for high wages. Wage earners must receive good wages in order to be good buyers. I have always voted against what is known as the "gag rule."

#### HOW VETERANS AFFECTED

We have before us today a situation that we must soon face. We will have to cast our votes on a rule that is known as a "gag rule." It is really not entitled to that name, but if our opponents get any consolation out of it, we will admit it. The distinguished gentleman who preceded me said:

If you are in favor of the veterans, vote against this rule.

I want to make the statement that there is nothing in this rule that will make out of order any amendment on veterans' legislation that would be in order if we did not pass the rule.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, a ranking member of the Rules Committee, if that is correct?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is absolutely correct. There is no question about that.



Mr. PATMAN. So we can dismiss veterans' legislation from consideration when we vote on the rule.

Mr. LUNDEEN. But it does apply to the widows of Civil War veterans, does it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Only 10 percent off the Civil War veterans' widows, and if the World War widows can take a 100 percent reduction and the Spanish-American War widows can take a 50-percent reduction on non-service-connected cases, certainly the Civil War widows can take a 10-percent reduction on non-service-connected cases.

Mr. LUNDEEN. They cannot take it without starving to death.

#### FEDERAL EMPLOYEES MAY GET ALL RESTORED

Mr. PATMAN. The civil-service employees will have restored in this bill an appropriation from July 1 of this year—1934—until June 30 next year—1935—covering 33½ percent of what they have lost. The bill also provides that the President may restore the other 66½ of the reduction when the cost of living increases. I should like to see them get it all back, but remember this, gentlemen, that we have a very definite program for recovery that we are trying to follow. We do not want to disrupt that program. I do not believe the Federal employees desire to run the risk of injuring economic recovery by insisting upon whole restoration of salaries at this time when they may get total restoration anyway.

#### HOMES SAVED

When the present leader in the White House came into power there were millions of people all over this Nation on bended knees praying that some way would be devised that would permit them to save their homes. I saw old men and old women break down and cry like little children because they were losing their homes. This condition existed all over this country. This program for national recovery sponsored by President Roosevelt is saving the homes of millions of people. The program calls for the use of the Government credit of this Nation for the purpose of saving people's homes and reducing the high interest burden which those people have been forced to bear. This is not only saving the homes of people in cities but saving the homes of people on the farms. They are not only given a longer time to pay their mortgage debts but in many cases they are scaled down, and in all cases the interest rate is considerably reduced. The leader in the White House is responsible for it. He is the man that we are following today.

#### DESTITUTION RELIEVED

When this depression started the statement was made: "Why can you not use Federal funds to relieve destitution?" "No", it was said, "it is unconstitutional to do that. We cannot do it." But our present leader said, "We have to do it, it must be done", and he has relieved people all over this Nation and gave them food, clothing, and necessities from Federal funds. President Hoover told the destitute to go to the Red Cross.

#### UNEMPLOYED HELP

When this depression started it was said, "Why can there not be some way devised that will permit people who are unemployed and who are able and willing and anxious to work to find some kind of job that will enable them to provide a living for themselves and their families?" and this great leader has provided a way for millions and millions of these people to work and to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families. Mr. Hoover told this large group to go to the Red Cross.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GLOVER. I regard the gentleman as being our best authority on veterans' legislation. Many of us hope to see legislation passed at this Congress for the relief of Spanish-American War veterans and other veterans whom we think ought to have relief. Do I understand the gentleman to say, based on his knowledge of veterans' affairs, that nothing in this rule would prevent us from considering legislation that is now pending affecting that very question?

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, but I am not entitled to be called an authority on veterans' legislation; however, that is my understanding in regard to veterans' affairs inquired about; and, furthermore, the Chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, has already announced that there will be hearings on veterans' legislation, and there is nothing in this rule that you vote for that will prevent such legislation from passing this House or in any way interfering with it. It is ridiculous and absurd for one to vote against this rule on the theory that it will be detrimental to veterans.

Mr. ZIONCHECK, Mr. O'MALLEY, and Mr. BRITTEN rose.

Mr. PATMAN. Obviously, gentlemen, I cannot yield to all of you. I have only 2 or 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). The gentleman from Texas has declined to yield.

#### FARMERS HELPED

Mr. PATMAN. Not only has this program been adopted for the purpose of relieving destitution and giving people jobs but also to restore the purchasing power of the farmers of this country, and may I invite the attention of my friend from Massachusetts, Mr. MONNERY, to the fact that I was in Lynn, Mass., a couple of years ago and shoe workers there were walking the streets? They were unemployed. Why? Because there was no market for shoes; and I am very pleased to tell the gentleman that the people in the South and the West and in the agricultural sections of the country are buying more shoes today than they ever bought before because the purchasing power is being restored to people who need shoes, and I hope the time will soon come when his section will be able to put all the shoe workers to work, but certainly this will not be done until purchasing power is restored. The President is determined to restore farm prices.

#### PRESIDENT AGAINST IT

I should like to see the Federal employees get all their pay back, especially the ones receiving salaries less than \$3,000 annually, but this great leader of ours, who says he is going to relieve destitution, give unemployed people jobs, save people's homes in the cities and on the farms, and restore the buying power of the people, does not want this pay restored now and I am not going to do anything that would have a tendency to disrupt his program, because it is a great program. It is relieving distress and misery and bringing happiness and prosperity to many of our people. We want it to go onward and forward. All of us cannot be leaders. We must follow someone in a time like this who has a constructive program. We cannot expect a program to be presented that we will agree with in its entirety.

Mr. CONNERY and Mr. SIROVICH rose.

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, because I mentioned the gentleman's name. Sorry I do not have the time to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman mentioned my name and I understood the gentleman to say that the people were all employed in Lynn, Mass. There are a number of shoe workers not employed and they will not be employed until we go to the 30-hour week. The gentleman also states that this rule does not affect the veterans. Such a legislative provision on an appropriation bill is the way we took the money away from the veterans the last time, and by defeating this rule we can give the money back to the veterans in the same way, but if we adopt the rule we cannot do it under this bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Any amendment that would be in order without this rule will still be in order with it, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the members of the



Rules Committee will bear me out in this statement. The gentleman can offer an amendment to increase the amount proposed to be appropriated for any class of veterans after this rule is adopted. It will not in any way affect such an amendment.

#### WILL WE JOIN THE PRESIDENT'S ENEMIES?

Now, suppose it does affect the veterans. What are you going to do? Are you going to disrupt this great program I have been telling you about that involves not only 2 or 3 or 4 million people but involves 50 or 60 or 100 million people? Probably the President is wrong in his views, but he is our President; he is our leader. Are you going to throw any kind of monkey wrench into the program, and will you line up with the President's enemies? Who are they? Well, the Power Trust. They do not like the President because he has not been doing what they wanted done. The speculators do not like him; Wall Street bankers do not like him, and he has hit the international bankers right square between the eyes. The Republican Party does not like him. So are you going to line up with all these groups and jeopardize the whole recovery program in order to try to help the Federal employees get the remaining 10 percent of the 15-percent reduction at this time when they will possibly get it under this bill, anyway. [Applause.]

#### THE PRESIDENT WITH A GOOD PROGRAM

No President has done more to help laborers, wage earners, farmers, low-salaried people, and just the average man, woman, and child of this country generally than President Roosevelt. I do not agree with him on some of his views in regard to veterans' legislation and reduction of pay to low-salaried Government employees. It seems inconsistent for the Government to reduce pay of low-salaried people and at the same time encourage private industry to increase the pay of low-salaried people. Although I do not agree with the President on some things, yet I believe that he is doing as much to bring this country back as is possible for a President to do. One thing sure, Wall Street representatives cannot go into the back door of the White House and find out what is going to be done in order that they may defraud the people on the stock market by having the information in advance. It is the first time in 12 or 13 years that Wall Street has not had entree to the White House. The President is fighting the battles of the plain people of this country—the poor, the needy, the unemployed, and the ones in financial distress. He is on record in favor of independent business, regulation or prevention of speculation on products of the soil, and restoring the same kind of dollar to the people to pay their debts with that existed when the debts were created. He is at least doing something. He is not sitting down twiddling his thumbs, as some of our former Presidents did in great emergencies. He will probably make mistakes. He has asked the people not to expect him to be right all the time.

#### EXACT JUSTICE NOT POSSIBLE

The people cannot expect exact justice to be administered by human beings in compliance with general laws for the whole country. There will always be just and meritorious complaints of inequalities and injustices. The broad program, however, is against the rotten, crooked, unscrupulous political and financial management of the past and in favor of the general welfare.

#### WHO WILL BE PLEASED WITH THE PRESIDENT'S DEFEAT

It would be very pleasing indeed to the Mitchells, Morgans, Mellons, and Wiggins for the President to suffer defeat. It would be pleasing to all Wall Street bankers and other credit manipulators and international scoundrels for the President to suffer this temporary defeat, and it would especially be pleasing to the Republican Party and all others who are interested in voting against the President for the sole and only reason that it is good political strategy on their part. I refuse to join the President's enemies, and although I do not agree with all of his program in every detail, I am going to hold up his hand and assist him in his efforts to give the country substantial and lasting prosperity.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. KAHN].

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, everyone realizes the necessity for government economy and would not cavil at it under ordinary circumstances, but when in extragovernmental activities we find money is being paid to the employees far in advance of the money paid to the regular governmental people who are doing a faithful work, we realize that this difference in pay breaks down the morale and is bad for the efficiency of the Departments.

I should like to give a few figures showing these discrepancies.

Under the 1930 Classification Act we find clerical and mechanical services paid, grade 1, 55 cents to 60 cents an hour; grade 2, 67 to 70 cents an hour; grade 3, 75 to 80 cents an hour, less the 15 percent reduction.

Under the schedule paid by the extragovernmental activity, the Civil Works Administration, we find that the maximum time for working is 30 hours a week, with certain administrative exceptions, and for purposes of wages the country is divided into three zones, and the authorized maximum pay in each zone is given with their equivalents per month, per year, maximum working time.

Now, we realize that the maximum pay is really the minimum. In the southern zone skilled labor such as I have designated is paid \$1 an hour, \$135 a month, or \$1,560 a year. In the central zone skilled labor is \$1.10 an hour, or \$144 a month, or \$1,716 a year. In the northern zone labor is paid \$1.20 an hour, \$162 a month, or \$1,872 a year. Clerical work is paid in the northern zone \$968 a year, \$1,092 a year, and \$1,240 a year.

Now compare this with the civil-service salaries with 17 percent of the employees receiving less than \$1,000 a year base pay, 25 percent getting less than \$1,200 a year base pay, and 60 percent getting less than \$2,000 a year base pay.

The newspapers of January 8 contain an announcement that the P.W.A. is spending \$58,000,000 giving employment to 280,357 men. That would be at a cost of \$242 a month per man.

Study the tables inserted and draw your own conclusion.

Now, it seems to me that at least a small portion of this great sum might be used to restore the 15 percent cut and relieve the suffering of the Spanish War veterans and the widows and orphans. [Applause.]

I insert the following figures:

#### FIGURES ON CIVIL SERVICE AND EMERGENCY PAY ROLLS

As of January 1932 there were 732,460 persons employed in the civil service receiving salaries as follows:

Up to \$1,000.....	124, 678
\$1,000 to \$1,100.....	.....
\$1,100 to \$1,200.....	12, 157
\$1,200 to \$1,300.....	37, 558
\$1,300 to \$1,400.....	20, 243
\$1,400 to \$1,500.....	24, 643
\$1,500 to \$1,600.....	24, 044
\$1,600 to \$1,700.....	28, 398
\$1,700 to \$1,800.....	20, 023
\$1,800 to \$1,900.....	35, 690
\$1,900 to \$2,000.....	32, 776
Up to \$2,000 (60 percent).....	417, 089
\$2,000 to \$2,100.....	24, 186
\$2,100 to \$2,200.....	116, 759
Up to \$2,200 (76 percent).....	558, 034
\$2,200 to \$2,300.....	13, 078
\$2,300 to \$2,400.....	25, 375
\$2,400 to \$2,500.....	23, 225
\$2,500 to \$2,600.....	49, 138
\$2,600 to \$2,700.....	15, 116
\$2,700 to \$2,800.....	6, 493
\$2,800 to \$2,900.....	5, 047
\$2,900 to \$3,000.....	3, 984
Up to \$3,000 (95 percent).....	699, 489
\$3,000 to \$3,100.....	3, 512
\$3,100 to \$3,200.....	1, 083
\$3,200 to \$3,300.....	4, 484
\$3,300 to \$3,400.....	2, 343
\$3,400 to \$3,500.....	1, 825
\$3,500 to \$3,600.....	1, 987
\$3,600 to \$3,700.....	1, 358

\$3,700 to \$3,800.....	936
\$3,800 to \$3,900.....	2, 875
\$3,900 to \$4,000.....	251

Up to \$4,000 (98 percent).....	720, 863
\$4,000 to \$4,100.....	1, 578
\$4,100 to \$4,200.....	153
\$4,200 to \$4,400.....	872
\$4,400 to \$4,600.....	722
\$4,600 to \$4,800.....	2, 250
\$4,800 to \$5,000.....	1, 286

Up to \$5,000.....	727, 724
\$5,000 to \$5,200.....	919
\$5,200 to \$5,400.....	374
\$5,400 to \$5,600.....	311
\$5,600 to \$5,800.....	905
\$5,800 to \$6,000.....	303
\$6,000 to \$6,500.....	698
\$6,500 to \$7,000.....	309
\$7,000 to \$7,500.....	244
\$7,500 to \$8,000.....	150
\$8,000 to \$8,500.....	133
\$8,500 to \$9,000.....	40
\$9,000 to \$10,000.....	133
\$10,000 to \$11,000.....	134
\$11,000 to \$12,000.....	6
\$12,000 to \$15,000.....	41
\$15,000 and up.....	31

#### ENROLLMENT, COST, AND PAY OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Average enrollment is approximately 300,000.

The cost of the first 8 months, April through November, is given as \$186,000,000, or an average of \$25,250,000 per month.

This makes an average cost per man per month of \$77.50.

Wages are paid the men at the rate of \$30 base pay, \$45 for 5 percent of them, and \$36 for an additional 8 percent. At these rates the monthly pay roll would be:

Base pay for 300,000, at \$30.....	\$9, 000, 000
Additional \$15 for 5 percent.....	225, 000
Additional \$6 for 8 percent.....	144, 000

Total, pay roll..... 9, 369, 000

Deducting this from total monthly expenses, we have approximately \$13,881,000 for expenses other than pay rolls. This is an average of \$46 per month per man, presumably largely for food, shelter, maintenance, clothing, and so forth.

Assuming that a man's necessities, and so forth, procured at this cost are worth \$46 a month to him, the C.C.C. workers receive in cash or in value pay as follows:

	5 percent of workers	8 percent of workers	Remain- der of workers
Monthly expenses of food, shelter, maintenance, clothing, etc., per man.....	\$46	\$46	\$46
Monthly base pay and extra allowances.....	45	36	30
Total per month.....	91	82	76
Total, per year.....	1, 092	984	912

In comparison with the Army and Navy, even a stronger picture could be presented.

#### WAGES PAID BY THE CIVIL WORKS ADMINISTRATION

The maximum working time for labor is 30 hours a week, with certain administrative exceptions. For purposes of wages the country is divided into three zones, and the authorized maximum pay in each zone is given as follows, with their equivalents per month and per year, maximum working time:

	Per hour rate	Per month equiva- lent	Per year equiva- lent
Southern zone:			
Skilled.....	\$1. 00	\$135. 00	\$1, 560
Unskilled.....	. 40	54. 00	625
Central zone:			
Skilled.....	1. 10	148. 50	1, 716
Unskilled.....	. 45	60. 75	702
Northern zone:			
Skilled.....	1. 20	162. 00	1, 872
Unskilled.....	. 50	67. 50	780

Clerical wages are authorized to be paid as follows:

	Base	Inter- mediate	Oper- ating	Super- vision	Tech- nical super- vision
Southern zone.....	\$12	\$15	-----	\$18	\$18-\$35
Central zone.....	15	18	-----	21	21- 40
Northern zone.....	18	21	\$24	-----	24- 45
Northern zone, equivalent annuity....	956	1, 092	1, 240	-----	2, 340

Compare with civil-service salaries, with 17 percent of employees receiving less than \$1,000 a year base pay, 25 percent get less than \$1,200 and 60 percent less than \$2,000.

#### PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION, MISCELLANEOUS

Newspapers on January 8 cite an announcement of the P.W.A. that it is spending \$58,000,000 in nongovernmental projects in 41 States, thus giving employment for 1 month to 240,357 men. This would be at the cost of \$242 per man per month.

Under civil service clerical-mechanical services are paid: Grade 1, 55 to 60 cents per hour; grade 2, 65 to 70 cents per hour; grade 3, 75 to 80 cents per hour. Less 15 percent, 1930 classification skilled labor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has 43 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] 53 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly to find that my position on this legislation is in opposition to our majority members of the Rules Committee. But I am of the opinion that this rule is not necessary to put over the President's recovery program. I do not think that his program needs any such gag rule.

In addition to that, my opposition to this rule is based on the fact that as chairman of one of the legislative committees of the House I do not believe that I have the moral right to preclude that committee of the possibility of considering legislation from now until the termination of this Congress by my act in voting for this rule today.

I am opposed to this rule because it runs from now on and only terminates when we stop work at the end of the session.

Another objection is that we have before us in the Post Office Committee legislation which may be approved by the Postmaster General, and perhaps after a conference with the President it may receive his support, but with this rule adopted we may be prevented from taking any such action.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. No; I am sorry. I have only a few minutes. Let me tell you of some of the discriminations that affect postal employees which are unfair and unjust, because they are called upon to suffer all out of proportion to what most of you Members may realize. The postal employee will not only be called upon to suffer his 10-percent cut, but there will be the continued hazard of the furlough cut hanging over his head. In addition to that, the ban against promotions in the service will be hanging over his head, and in addition to that there is a reduction in the travel allowance in the Railway Mail Service for those men who live away from home nearly as much as they live at home. In addition to that no one may be promoted to a supervisory grade in the Post Office Service except by Executive order, so that some clerks might be performing the duties of a supervisor, assuming the added responsibilities, and yet by a continuation of this program he will draw only the salary of a clerk.

In addition to that, the postmasters have not only suffered the pay cut, but they also suffer a 10-percent cut in the receipts on which their salaries are based. In addition to that the pay schedule and grade of the supervisor in the substation is based upon the number of employees, and the positions made vacant by the retirement of regular employees are filled by substitutes, and that employment does



not count in determining the number of supervisors in that office, nor does it count in determining the wages of the supervisory officials in such offices. So, by reason of this rule, I believe we perpetuate not a 10-percent wage cut, but a wage cut that runs all the way from 20 to 25 percent in the Postal Service.

In order that we might approach this question in an intelligent manner, our committee is anxious to take up such discriminations with the Post Office Department and with the President of the United States, and how inconsistent it would be if I should prevent my committee and the President and the Postal Department by my action from further consideration of these matters.

Another question I desire to bring to your attention is the conditions of our substitutes. It is the most deplorable situation we are called upon to meet. The most pathetic figure in my judgment in the employ of the United States today is the poorly paid post-office substitute. No matter where you go, you will find men in every walk of life condemning the Congress of the United States for the indefensible position we find ourselves in in condemning these men to the meager wages which they are receiving as a result of the Economy Act.

Postal substitutes are receiving all the way from \$1 to perhaps \$20 a week. The average is very low. They are on our charity relief rolls, and in these days of recovery and reform, I merely want to have the privilege to legislate on conditions that are certainly intolerable and indefensible. So I say to you, a rule such as the one we are now considering that applies today, tomorrow, next week, and next month in my judgment is an unjust rule and ought not to be supported by those who believe in eliminating unfair, unjust discriminations in the Postal Service, the Federal service, the Veterans Administration, or any other service. [Applause].

Mr. STUDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. STUDLEY. I understood the gentleman to say that some of the substitutes of the post-office employees are on the charity rolls. In New York they cannot get on the charity roll if they are employed by the Government. They have applied to me and asked if anything could be done, men who earn as low as \$5 a week and have families to support.

Mr. MEAD. I am in thorough agreement with my colleague from New York. Being a postal substitute is a handicap under existing law, because the minute he tells the employment agency, the welfare or relief officers that he is a postal employee he is unwelcome and he cannot receive the consideration which other citizens are entitled to.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. I wonder if the gentleman, as Chairman of the Postal Committee, has thought of remedying this situation. The Civil Service Commission is continuing to hold examinations for postal employees while there is a great surplus of substitute carriers. I wonder if the gentleman would not introduce a bill to take care of that situation so that before we create any more substitutes we will put these substitutes that we now have on a decent living scale. I think the Members would vote for a bill of that kind.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the gentleman. He makes a good point, but we will not be able to enact such legislation under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, in 10 minutes I shall not be able to follow my usual inclination and yield whenever a colleague asks me to, because I do think it very important to reiterate and clear up, if it is possible to clear up, one or two very obvious misapprehensions with reference to the effect of the proposed rule. In the first place let this be thoroughly understood, and I direct my remarks particularly to my colleagues on the Democratic side. There

is no possible question or shadow of a doubt about the fact that the President desires to have this legislation. Entirely separate and apart from what my individual idea about the merits of it may be, or yours, there is no doubt about that fact, because the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in company with the subcommittee chairmen, waited upon the President and conferred with him at length. He considered the matter deliberately and carefully, and heard there from some of the members of that gathering some of the arguments that have been made here today, and the President considers a continuation of these provisions of his economy program absolutely essential for the next fiscal year. I do not hesitate to say to you, as I said to the President, that I should like to see the full amounts for salary restoration July 1 put in the bills, with the continued right in the President to make reductions if necessary, but, gentlemen, we are in war today, an economic war, just as we were some months ago.

It is true we have advanced. Many of the people who were then starving are now eating, but it is no time for me, a private in the ranks, to undertake to distract the attention of the Commander in Chief on a matter of strategy. I must, if I am a soldier, yield my individual opinions at certain points, and that is what the President has asked the Members of Congress to do today.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I cannot yield in 10 minutes.

Now, let us get one matter definitely out of the way right now. There is absolutely nothing in this rule which in any way precludes any effort that anybody desires to make to reinstate veterans' relief. If any gentleman wishes to challenge that, I will yield to him.

Mr. MAY and Mr. CONNERY rose.

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. This rule precludes an amendment to this appropriation bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. No, sir; it does not. I know the gentleman is sincere. This rule precludes amendment to title II of the Economy Act. Title II is not the veterans' part of the Economy Act.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes; it is; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; title II is not. Title I is the part of the Economy Act dealing with veterans.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. In just a moment I will yield.

We will clear this up if you will bear with me a moment. When we get to the appropriating part of this bill the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] can offer a motion to put back \$200,000,000 for veterans' relief, if he desires to do it.

Mr. CONNERY. But when we pass this rule now, we practically put into effect everything that was in the economy bill that was passed last session?

Mr. WOODRUM. No, no; the gentleman is mistaken. May I call attention to this—this is where I think we have gotten the wrong impression about it: There were two distinct and separate parts of the economy bill that was passed last year. Title I, or that portion dealing with veterans' relief, and that was permanent legislation. Now, please bear that in mind. We delegated to the President of the United States authority to readjust payments to veterans and issue regulations thereon, which said regulations, when promulgated, have the effect of basic law. So it is not necessary now to reenact any portions of the economy bill passed last year which have to do with cuts in payments to veterans, and they are not involved in the reenacted sections of this bill. The only sections here involved are those sections having to do with pay cuts and automatic promotions and other matters entirely separate and apart from veterans, with two exceptions—the cut for Civil War veterans and the cut on pensions paid by private bills.

Mr. CONNERY. But we continue the veterans' situation as it was under the economy bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. We do not continue it by this rule. It is continued anyway.

Mr. CONNERY. But we stop any opportunity in this appropriation bill to get back the benefits which the veterans lost in that economy bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, no; we do not stop it at all.

Mr. CONNERY. Then, why the rule?

Mr. WOODRUM. Let me reiterate this, please: The cut in employees' salaries was a temporary 1-year cut. Therefore, unless we reenact that legislation for the next fiscal year the authority of the President to make that cut expires on July 1. This appropriation bill would have to carry 100 percent for the salaries; but the cut pertaining to veterans was basic law, and we do not have to reenact it.

Mr. CONNERY. All right. Now, will the gentleman tell me, in this appropriation bill, how we could get back the benefits for the veterans? Suppose I should make a motion to raise the amount from \$250,000,000 to \$400,000,000, how can we get the money for the veterans?

Mr. WOODRUM. You can raise the amount from \$250,000,000 to \$400,000,000, but you cannot by legislation on an appropriation bill, change the basic law.

Mr. CONNERY. That is why I say we should vote down the rule and get this thing discussed right.

Mr. WOODRUM. But this rule does not affect that. The rule has nothing to do with that.

Mr. CONNERY. Yes, it has. It gags you any way you look at it.

Mr. WOODRUM. If the rule were not here at all and we came down to the section of this bill relating to veterans and the gentleman from Massachusetts got up and offered a motion to pay Spanish-American War veterans \$60 a month, the motion would be out of order because it would be legislation on an appropriation bill; but the gentleman could provide \$100,000,000 for pension payments, and that would be in order, entirely separate and apart from this rule.

Mr. CONNERY. That would lie dormant and nothing could be done about it unless the economy bill were changed.

Mr. WOODRUM. You can do that under this rule, if it is adopted.

Mr. CONNERY. Does the gentleman mean we can change the economy bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. No. This has nothing to do with the portions of the economy bill relating to veterans.

Mr. CONNERY. But I say that money would lie dormant and nothing would be done unless you repealed the economy bill.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McSWAIN. Assuming that this Congress should, before it adjourns, enact legislation that would modify the basic law with regard to benefits for veterans, nowhere, by any appropriation bill, can we get the money to pay the amounts created by such basic law if we cannot offer an amendment to any subsequent appropriation bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. This will be the situation: The rule prevents any deviation from the economy bill, but it does not hit the veterans at all. I will have to answer the gentleman by saying what I said to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], that we have not precluded any veterans' relief by the passage of this rule.

Mr. McSWAIN. But assume that this Congress should pass some remedial legislation to correct injustices that everybody under the sun admits exist, where will we get the money to pay them?

Mr. WOODRUM. Appropriate it. There is nothing to stop it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. But you cannot get it under this rule unless it comes from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. It says any amendment to any appropriation bill from now on is out of order, unless offered by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; it does not say anything of the kind.

It says:

Any amendment to any appropriation bill in conflict with those sections therein enumerated—

Which have to do with salaries, not veterans' payments.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. I understand from the gentleman's explanation that under the veterans' section you could appropriate \$200,000,000 more, or any amount you wanted to, but it would serve no practical purpose because you could not legislate as to how the additional appropriation should be used. Is this correct?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct, and may I follow the gentleman up and say there is nothing whatever to prevent Congress at any time, if it is so advised, by legislation to change the basic law with reference to that or any portion of the economy bill.

Mr. HEALEY. But by increasing the appropriation you would not be doing the veterans' cause any good.

Mr. WOODRUM. Not a bit.

Mr. HEALEY. Because you cannot direct how it shall be used.

Mr. WOODRUM. Exactly.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. McFARLANE. I call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to this provision of the rule:

Amendments shall not be in order to any other section of the bill H.R. 6663 or to any section of any general appropriation bill of the Seventy-third Congress which would be in conflict with the provisions of title II of the bill H.R. 6663 as reported to the House, except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

This is my question: Let us say we pass a bill to repeal the Economy Act; we get to the door of the Treasury; we are trying to pay these boys something; but if this rule is adopted, what good will it be to pass in the future a bill amending the Economy Act if you are going to nail the lid on and let the Appropriations Committee control the situation?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think the gentleman has asked a very fair and a very important question. There is not any doubt about the fact that if you pass this rule you close the door insofar as those sections of the Economy Act are concerned, unless and until the Congress shall repeal or modify the Economy Act, but there are no sections in here involved with reference to veterans. Now, why the necessity to make this rule apply to succeeding appropriation bills?

We must have some uniform policy with reference to appropriations. You do not want the independent offices bill to carry a restoration to 90 percent and the Interior Department bill to carry a restoration to 100 percent, and some other bill to carry some other percent. This rule is necessary for the purpose of establishing conclusively that you are going to back the President in his proposal to give back 5 percent to the employees July 1, and then have the right to reinstate so much of the remaining 10 percent in the next fiscal year as the cost of living may justify. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, this rule is the most vicious thing I have seen in my short service in the House. To my mind it is a challenge to any man or woman in this House claiming to have a mind of his or her own. It is an insult to the Membership of this House, and particularly to the membership of the majority party.

Leaders of the majority party, and particularly the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], said he was not worried about the attitude of the majority Members. Apparently he feels, according to that statement—and he as



much as says so—that he has you under control. Were I a member of the majority party, I would resent very much such an inference. I believe, however, that any man or woman who votes for this rule is admitting that he or she is under the direct control of the leaders; and I do not believe this should be the attitude of, or that it is even the privilege of, Members of Congress sent here to represent their constituencies. I do not believe they have the right, even if they choose to do so, to surrender their prerogatives as Members of Congress. I do not believe they have the right under the Constitution of the United States, under our theory of government, to surrender to the Appropriations Committee, or to any individual or group of individuals, the control of their votes. I believe every liberal-minded man and woman in this House will from the bottom of his or her heart resent any such gag rule as that proposed here this afternoon. I hope a sufficient number of Members on the Democratic side of the House will join with us on the other side to vote down this rule. The Democrats have a majority of over 200. Certainly this should give them a large enough majority to pass such legislation as their leaders might want without putting the gag rule into effect.

It seems to me that to presume to bring in such a rule as this is tantamount to saying they do not trust their own Members to vote according to the dictates of their consciences. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, if we are opposed to limiting restoration of the pay of Federal employees to the 5 percent the President proposes, we are justified in opposing this rule; but I do not concede that anyone is justified in opposing it on the ground that it will bar them from appropriating for the relief of veterans in response to any legislation that may be passed this session. In other words, it does not affect that.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. I cannot yield. I am sorry.

Mr. McFARLANE. I want to clear up a matter.

Mr. BROWNING. I am quite clear. The gentleman is the only one who is muddy.

The only question involved is whether you want now to lay down a uniform rule for the session with regard to the question of increased pay for Federal employees or whether you want this question to come up on every appropriation bill and in different amounts for each department of the Government.

Veterans' legislation is not affected. Even if it were covered, even granting for the sake of argument that veterans' legislation were included, the Appropriations Committee would be obligated to make any appropriation the House may direct them to make from now to the end of the session; and I believe the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will stand up and tell you so, if you ask him. I think everybody recognizes this to be the rule. If any part of the veterans' program is covered by the rule, the Appropriations Committee will be bound to make the appropriation under this rule for any added benefits. Furthermore, if the House defies the Economy Act and restores some of the veterans' benefits taken from them last session, the Committee on Appropriations will be glad to follow the mandate, and we need have no concern about it now.

This is just a plain question of the amount of increase that we want to vote for Federal employees, and the veterans' compensation is not in it at all. Do not confuse the issue. There is no way of getting it in here. The matter is entirely plain that veterans' increases made by direct legislation can be covered by the Appropriations Committee under this rule and will be. They are commanded to do it. I will ask the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BUCHANAN] if it is not a fact that his committee recognizes, and will recognize, the obligation to bring in an appropriation for any authorization made for veterans in this session of Congress?

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the legislative Committee on Veterans' Affairs, or any other committee, brings in a bill which

passes the House and becomes a law authorizing an appropriation for the veterans, or anything else, I, as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, would feel it my bounden duty to report back to this House for action an appropriation bill carrying out the mandate of Congress as expressed in the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McSWAIN. And that completely answers the inquiry I made of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have not the time to go in detail into the effect of this legislation, but if there was a mirror right in front of you gentlemen the answer would be there. I wish you could just see your own expressions. You look terribly worried. You know perfectly well that besides stifling your voice this gag rule is contrary to your true conscience and is un-American. And you will be deliberately gagging yourselves. I would have a good deal of pity for you if you were not able-bodied men, but you are able-bodied men. You can get up here on the floor of the House and fight, and fight hard, but when regulations concerning the veterans were rewritten, in effect they gagged disabled men and women and elderly widows. Those men and women were bound hand and foot by administration regulations and thrown into the river, so to speak, and told to swim for their compensation.

Why did I have a man in my office in Washington all summer to help the veterans with their cases? They were sick mentally and physically. They were not able to fight. Why did I have a man in my office in Lowell in order to help the veteran men and women in my district? They were disabled. There were widows and children. They did not have a chance to fight for themselves. They did not understand the law. They were bewildered and living in fear of the future. They did not understand the regulations. They did not know how to present their claims. They could not secure a sufficiently long hearing of their claims without the assistance of a Member of Congress, or his or her representative. This was necessary in order that even just a little time might be given to the presentation of their claims. It was really pathetic. You know how rapidly those claims were settled or were not settled at all. Do you realize there are 24,000 forms filed by Spanish War veterans for a review on appeal now pending before the Bureau? You know that the boards did not have time to decide the merits of these cases as they were told that the cases must be finished at a very early date. Many cases should be reviewed again. You and I know that the doubt always had to be resolved in favor of the Government and not in favor of the veteran. In other words, the veteran had to prove his case. That is why I have extra people in my office to assist me. There are so many veterans I cannot help them all by myself.

Why bind yourselves to keep quiet so far as the Federal employees are concerned? Take the substitute carriers in our various post offices, for instance. Do you know that I have been told that the average pay of the substitute carrier is \$1 a day? Think of it—\$1 a day! And those substitute carriers have to report at 7 o'clock in the morning and must not leave until 12 o'clock noon and be available all during the day. How can they earn money any other way? That is the plight of some of our postal carriers. You know how greatly overworked the regular letter carriers are as a result of the Economy Act and its effect in the Postal Department. You also know that business firms are not able to have their business carried on satisfactorily because they do not have the late evening mail collections. This is also due to the economy program. If those collections could be made, it would mean work for the substitute carriers. The business of the country could be carried on much better. You know the number of men who are actually sick or practically sick on duty carrying mail, particularly in the very severe climates, because their work has been so arduous. It has been cold in New England this winter with a lot of snow. You can appreciate the hardship that has been endured there by these men.



You men and women have strength. You have strength to fight for what you want. You know very well that you do not want to vote to gag yourselves, not only for today or for future appropriation bills. You know you do not. Please vote against this rule. I urge you to assert your manhood and your womanhood. How can you go back to the people of your district and face your veterans, your Federal employees? How can the gentleman from Texas, for instance, talk to his veterans?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts state that she has never voted for a gag rule when the Republicans were in the majority?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No. I never voted for such a rule as is proposed today.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentlewoman has voted for a lot of gag rules.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman is going to bring up the party feature, I will ask the gentleman if he does not realize that the greatest benefits to our veterans accrued under the Republican administration? That is equally true of the benefits accrued to the Federal employees.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I did not feel it necessary to speak on the question of the rule until the last remark of the charming lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] compelled me to take the floor. She had the audacity to state that benefits to the veterans of the United States happened—and that is the appropriate word—under a Republican administration. Why, any benefits to any veterans occurred after two thirds of every vote cast for the benefit of the veterans came from this Democratic side of the House. Every benefit for the veterans had to be dragged out of the Republican administrations since Harding. When the veterans shall erect a monument to their champion down here on the Mall, it will never be to a Harding, to a Coolidge, to a Hoover, or to a Snell. It will be erected to the credit of somebody like WRIGHT PATMAN or GORDON BROWNING or "BILL" CONNERY, who sit on this Democratic side of the House, and not on the Republican side of the House. [Applause.]

When labor and the working people of our Nation shall erect a monument to its champions, no Republican individual—yea, not even that old G.O.P. elephant—will sit upon the pedestal of that monument, because in every State in this Union and in this National Legislature, labor, the veteran, and the working man and woman of this Nation have only wrung from the Republican Party, happening to be in power at the time, anything they ever got for their benefit, and then only by the majority support of the Democratic Party.

Now, I intend as to this measure to continue to support the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt. I do so out of no "abject surrender" or in the nature of a "rubber stamp", as the "cooperating" politics-playing Republicans would say. The minority is playing politics. One hundred and fifteen men on the Republican side of this House propose to vote as a unit against this rule, not from their hearts but in an attempt to scuttle the administration by cajoling possibly 75 Members on the Democratic side of the House to blindly go along with them. I feel confident, however, there are not anywhere near 75 Democratic Members who will fall into that political trap.

Imagine the Republicans championing the cause of the Federal employees. Since when? God save the mark. Since when have these Philadelphia and Pittsburgh Republicans become the champions of the working man? [Laughter.] Since when has the G.O.P. been the champion of the veteran?

I propose to go along with the President because I know he is right. That is why I have been consistently going

along with him—because he has been right in every instance, and 99 percent of our people endorse everything he has done.

As to Federal salaries and the cost of living, the President had the facts before him. The President had exact information that the average wage of the man in private industry has been reduced from 20 to 50 percent since 1928. Why, I have hundreds of men and women in my district in New York City who have been cut 100 percent, not 15, because they have walked the streets of my city for 2 or 3 years without any wages. They would gladly have taken a 15-percent cut.

It is only because of the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, alone of all the country, of a little less than 15 percent less than 1928 that the President arrived at this gratuitous gift of a 5-percent increase to the Federal employees. Throughout the country the cost of living is still 21 percent plus less than in 1928.

Mr. Speaker, if there are any real champions of the Federal employees, they sit on this Democratic side of the House where they have always sat and not on the Republican, which caters at times to our governmental employees merely for political purposes.

If we here are to support the President, this is our first opportunity in this regular session of the Seventy-third Congress. I propose to go along with him because he is going along with me. I agree with him. I know he is right and that is why I am with him today. [Applause.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MCGUGIN].

Mr. MCGUGIN. Mr. Speaker, let us call the roll, based upon the truth of what Republican Presidents did pertaining to veterans' legislation. Mr. Harding vetoed the bonus. Mr. Coolidge vetoed the bonus. Mr. Hoover vetoed the advance payment of the first half of the bonus. So far the statements of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] are correct, but no further.

Mr. Hoover's message to the last Congress while he was President called upon Congress for some economy in veterans' expenditures, but he did not ask to take one single penny away from any veteran suffering from actual or presumptive service-connected disability. Mr. Hoover's message did not ask to take one penny away from a Spanish War veteran. Mr. Hoover's last message to the Congress would fit in perfectly with the American Legion program today, and the veterans of this country would ask no greater blessing from the hand of the Government than to have from this Government a program in perfect harmony with the last message sent to this Congress upon veterans' legislation by Mr. Hoover, a Republican President. [Applause.]

Now, coming down to this bill, there would only be one way that any relief could be given to veterans, and that would be upon page 27, where we might increase the total amount of the appropriation for pensions, but no further could we go.

If an amendment were offered increasing the appropriation and specifying so much for service-connected disability of World War veterans and so much for Spanish War veterans, we would be confronted with the proposition that it was adding legislation to this bill, and there we would be blocked by those in control of the House. Then pass this rule on top of that and you cannot touch veterans' legislation at any place in the bill.

I stood for the economy bill when it passed this House. I stood for it in keeping with the President's pledge that he would deal fairly and justly in this matter, and I had a right to believe that fair and just consideration would not take one penny away from any service-connected disabled World War veteran, actual or presumptive. [Applause.]

Even the Economy League, with all its harshness, never asked to take money away from service-connected disabled World War veterans; and today what this country is wanting us to do is to restore the last penny of pension benefits to World War service-connected disabled veterans, whether the service connection is actual or presumptive, and to deal fairly and squarely with the Spanish War veterans, which



means giving them additional pensions in a most substantial amount. [Applause.]

I am not afraid to meet the issue, and I am willing to meet it now. I do not need this gag rule to prohibit me from doing anything, lest I might not have the courage to do fairly as between the taxpayer on the one side and the veterans and public employees on the other side. Let us vote down this gag rule and legislate as honest legislators should legislate. If we vote it down, I will have the courage to vote against many demands which may be made by veterans and employees, but at the same time I should be glad to vote for some concessions which are rightfully due veterans and employees. I want the opportunity for this Congress to do the square thing by all the Spanish War veterans and by the World War veterans with service-connected disabilities, actual and presumptive. That has not been done under present regulations. The Economy Act as passed by the Congress has been ignored by the executive branch of this Government in dealing with Spanish War veterans, because that act provided that the presumption would be that the disabilities of Spanish War veterans were service connected. The executive department has given no fair regard to the provision that the disabilities of Spanish War veterans would be presumed to be service connected and that the burden would be upon the Government to prove that the disabilities were not service connected rather than upon the Spanish War veterans to prove that they were service connected. Likewise, in the case of World War veterans with service-connected disabilities, actual and presumptive, the executive department has not kept faith with the Congress or the country. Neither Congress nor the country expected compensation for these service-connected disabilities of World War veterans to be reduced by either reclassification of disabilities or percentage reduction. [Applause.] I thank you.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has 23½ minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania 32 minutes.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOPER].

Mr. HOOPER. Mr. Speaker, this is a large question upon which we are now engaged but it seems to me that there is a still larger one which has not been touched upon today. Everywhere throughout the world parliamentary government is on trial. Parliamentary government has failed in Germany, parliamentary government has failed in Italy, parliamentary government has failed over a large portion of the continent of Europe and throughout South America.

Parliamentary government in the United States is on trial today as it has never been before in the history of our country.

Bill after bill has come before us during the Seventy-third Congress. Bill after bill has come up and has been passed virtually without debate, undigested and not understood by the membership of the House.

Now we are called upon to pass a rule which takes away from the membership virtually the last vestige of right and power for which our forefathers have struggled for a thousand years.

I was one who voted against the economy bill, not so much on the question of veterans' compensation, but because I believed the membership did not understand the implications of the bill; they did not realize the results that might come from it.

I will vote against this rule more cheerfully than I voted against the economy bill last spring. The rule has been but briefly discussed, and not a Member in the House can realize its implications. It seems to me that if the members of the great Democratic Party, for which I have the utmost respect—it seems to me that if they want to live up to the principles of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Grover Cleveland, and Woodrow Wilson, they have a chance today to strike a real blow for the continuation of parliamentary government in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPPEL].

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago events occurred in Germany which we are endeavoring to duplicate here today. We are trying to Hitlerize the American Congress. [Applause.]

I am opposed to the gag rule, I am opposed to the leadership on my side of the House that denies the membership the right to speak in reference to the rule unless they know that the man is manacled and bound like a serf or slave. [Applause.]

What right have we as Representatives to come here to represent our constituents when our own leadership holds us in subjection and will not permit us to speak in accordance with the wishes of our constituents? That is not what our party stands for, and I resent it.

I call attention to another feature. You are denying to our Federal employees a just restoration of wages. Yet "Crack-Down Windy" Johnson favored his stenographer and raised her pay from \$100 a month to \$500 a month. That is what "Crack-Down" did. Every one of these patronage departments which we created in the last session is filled to overflowing with surplus men, men who are receiving large salaries, many whom I personally know to be incompetent, but they probably supported the party and must be paid fabulous salaries at the expense of the regular civil-service employee.

Our President asks us now to withhold from the Federal employees the just wage to which they are entitled. I wrote to the President and I also wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury and stated that by the failure to refund the \$6,238,000,000 of liberty loans we are actually paying more into the hands of the American bankers than we are proposing to restore here to the Federal employees.

Not only that, but the President yesterday requested validation of the principle of additional billions of tax-exempt bonds under the Federal Land Act, thus adding to the farmer's burden while he creates smiles for the coupon clippers of Wall Street. Every man who votes for this rule, from my point of view, is voting to cast himself into slavery. We might just as well go home and turn the entire operation of the Congress over to the "brain trust." I believe that it would be more economical to do so. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] to interrogate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the gentleman's statement of the effect of this rule upon veterans' legislation. I am satisfied now that we can remedy injustices done to service-connected veterans and Spanish War veterans, but I want also to ask him if it does prevent the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments from affecting the hours of pay and the condition of the substitutes in the Post Office Department? It does not, in my opinion.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not understand that it affects anything but the rate of pay which was provided in the Economy Act. It does perpetuate that; but, as I understand it, it does not prevent in any way the Post Office Committee from bringing in legislation affecting the hours or working conditions or anything of that kind.

Mr. BAILEY. Then, if we wish to consider a bill to lessen the hours of labor, to spread the available work, and therefore to give some substitutes a chance, it would simply affect the rate of pay, and we could still give them an increase in hours of work and thus an increase in pay received for such hours?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the main question which by our vote we are to solve today is whether the influence of the President of the United States, as our Commander in Chief, speaking for all the 120,000,000 Americans in this terrible war now existing, affects us more than do the com-



mands made upon us today by the leaders of the organized 850,000 employees of this Government, aided and abetted by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

It is a question of who is our leader. It is a question of whom we will follow. It is a question of whose commands we will take in this crucial period. It is a question of whether we will put the interests of the whole people of the United States above the selfish interests of the employees of our Government. It is a question of whether we will let these employees dictate to us. It is a question of whether we will be rubber stamps for these organizations of Government employees or whether we will back our President in his unselfish plans for the recovery of our whole Nation.

By passing the President's Economy Act, Public No. 2, in the last session, salaries of all Government employees were cut 15 percent. But the cut was only for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934. Unless legislation is now passed that affects all of the 10 supply bills for all of the 10 departments of Government and the independent offices, all of the basic salaries will be restored for the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, and there would be no salary cuts after that date. To prevent a restoration of all of the old salaries legislation must be passed.

The President has sent us his message, clear-cut and easily understood, that the Government cannot afford to restore these cuts dating back to last January 1, as demanded by the various organizations of Government employees, but that he is willing on next July 1, for the next fiscal year, to restore a third of the cut, so that such cut will be only 10 instead of 15 percent, and the President has asked us Democrats to support him in his plan.

And to put the plan of the President into execution and to carry out his financial policy it was necessary for the question to be decided once for all with respect to all employees, so in this first appropriation bill the legislation proposed by the President was made a part of it. But it being legislation, a point of order made by any Member, without a rule making it in order, would be sustained, knocking out of the bill this legislation; hence to keep it in the bill, it was necessary for this rule to be brought here and passed so that no point of order could eliminate it.

Naturally, such a rule must be iron-clad. Naturally, it must prevent amendments. If the program were amended, it would not be the President's program. If his necessary legislation were changed, it would not be what he wants. Were it open to amendment, do you not know that the diverse views of 435 Members of this House would change it so that it would not be what the President needs?

To us who have been here for many years, the antics of our friends across the aisle—the Republicans—are quite amusing. When we remember the autocratic domination of this House by Chairman Phil Campbell, and some of the gag rules he put over, this rule now before us seems liberal. When we remember some of the rules that gagged, hog-tied, blindfolded, and made Democrats speechless that were passed in this House by Chairman SNELL during Republican regime, we feel that there is ample precedent for almost any kind of party teamwork in this House.

For the benefit of some of our new colleagues, I want to remind them of one of the last gagging performances of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], then chairman of the Rules Committee. In the second session of the Seventy-first Congress, in April 1930, what was known as the "Rankin bill", for the relief of World War veterans, being bill H.R. 10381, was passed by this House. It was the only bill of that kind that was ever considered here under the general rules of this body. It was known as the most general and liberal bill to veterans that has ever been reported here. It was largely the work of our beloved and distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It was debated for days. It was considered and read under the general rules, open to all germane amendments.

It was amended repeatedly from the floor. Every Member had the right to offer his amendments and be heard on

same and to have a vote on same. This bill passed this House on April 24, 1930, by a record vote of 324 for it and only 49 votes against it. You will find the roll call on page 7673 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 24, 1930. Remember only 49 Members voted against its final passage. Such prominent Republicans as Mr. Cooper of Ohio; Mr. Darrow, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Fish, of New York; Mr. Frear, of Wisconsin; Mr. Gibson, of Vermont, who is now a Senator; Mr. Haugen; Mr. Hawley; Mr. Hooper; Mrs. Kahn; our good friend Clyde Kelly; Mr. Mapes, the present great minority leader of this House; Mr. Snell, who is now controlling you Republicans; Mr. Stalker; Mr. Treadway; and many of your other prominent Republicans voted for the bill and helped to pass it. They must have thought it was a good bill, or they would not have voted for it. As I said before, only 49 Members saw fit to vote against it, and then it went to the Senate.

The Senate debated it at length. The Senate passed this bill by a vote of 66 Senators for it and only 6 against it. Only six Senators thought that it was a bad bill. It was a 10-to-1 majority in the Senate. If you will look on page 11496 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 23, 1930, you will find the record vote by roll call of the Senate. The Senate amended the bill in many particulars, making it far more generous and liberal to the veterans than even the House bill was; and when the bill came back to the House, all of the Senate amendments were adopted by the House without a dissenting vote. You will find this action on page 11694 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 25, 1930. And the bill then went to the White House for the President's approval. It was Mr. Herbert Hoover, the Republican President, who was to pass on it. He promptly vetoed it and sent it back to Congress to die, unless both Houses could pass it by a two-thirds vote.

Then you saw Republicans turn tail, and right about. Then you saw them turn somersaults. Then you saw them become rubber stamps. Then you saw Mr. Republican Leader SNELL, of New York—who had voted for the bill on April 24, 1930, and who had let it as amended again pass the House on June 25, 1930, the last time without a dissenting voice raised against it—listen to the voice of his Commander in Chief in the White House and vote to kill it. And it was killed by Republican votes. Who were rubber stamps then? Whose master's voice controlled then? Who listened then to the White House? Who then obeyed? It was the Republican bellwethers of this House.

But now we come to the gag rule. On that eventful day, June 26, 1930, knowing just what kind of a measure President Hoover wanted, as soon as the House met, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] called up one of his rules, and passed it, and it was the prince of gag rules:

*Resolved*, That it shall be in order, beginning on Thursday, June 26, 1930, until the end of the present session of Congress, for the Speaker to recognize Members for motions to suspend the rules.

And it was passed. Do you know what that rule meant? Any Member who was thereafter recognized by the Speaker could pull out of his pocket a bill, large or small, 10 pages or 200 pages, written or printed, even though not another Member may have seen it, when it had been before no committee, and pass it with only 20 minutes of debate to the side, and when no Member would have the right to offer an amendment, or a motion to recommit, or change it in any particular. I immediately asked him the following questions:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand the proposed new veterans' legislation will be brought up in such shape that you cannot change it by dotting an "i" or crossing a "t." Is that the plan?

Mr. SNELL. That is the plan.

Then our present great Democratic Chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. POW] made the following observation (see p. 11824):

It may be under gag rule you will put through some substitute; but there will be an accounting day, and that day will be in the coming November.



And there was then called up a bill that no Democrat had even seen—one that had been approved and sent here by President Hoover from the White House—and it was passed under suspension of all rules, with only 20 minutes of debate to the side, and with no amendments whatever allowed, and with no motion to recommit of any kind allowed, and that was done under Snell regime.

It was all right for Republican Mr. SNELL, on June 26, 1930, to pass gag legislation from Republican Mr. Hoover, sent from the White House, but it is all wrong for Democratic Mr. BYRNS, on January 11, 1934, to pass a Democratic program sent here from a Democratic White House for the recovery of the United States.

This attempt here today to override President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his economy program was started months ago by the organizations of Government employees. When one of their presidents tried to get me in vacation to pledge my vote to go against the President, he said I was the only one, then, who had refused to thus pledge him. The following is the letter I wrote to him:

ABILENE, TEX., November 4, 1933.

HON. E. CLAUDE BABCOCK,  
National President American  
Federation of Government Employees,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BABCOCK: I have your letter, and will gladly answer your questions. You stated in the Washington Star that 25 Congressmen have pledged their vote to restore cuts in salaries of Government employees, I being the only one to oppose your plan. I note that the News there suggests organizing against me, by playing up the small salaries before the public. Washington papers don't like me. I stop raids.

You certainly remember that in the last Congress I fought against cutting the small salaries, but sought to cut to the bone all of the larger salaries. They must be reduced. You say, "We desire to ascertain the source of the information on which you base your assertion that Government employees draw from \$3,000 to \$10,000 per year." You surely will not deny such facts.

Look on page 3624 of the daily Record for February 8, 1932. The authentic official data there show that, excluding the \$75,000 President's salary, those of the Supreme Court justices, Cabinet officers, ministers to foreign countries, and the \$8,500-per-year salaries now paid Senators and Congressmen, this Government then had 32 employees drawing over \$15,000, 41 employees drawing \$12,000, 6 employees drawing \$11,000, 134 employees drawing \$10,000, 133 employees drawing \$9,000, 40 employees drawing \$8,500, 244 employees drawing \$7,000, 309 employees drawing \$6,500, 1,943 employees drawing \$6,000, 442 employees drawing \$5,800, 1,324 employees drawing \$5,600, 314 employees drawing \$5,400, 510 employees drawing \$5,200, 1,602 employees drawing \$5,000, 2,034 employees drawing \$4,800, 2,605 employees drawing \$4,600, 1,714 employees drawing \$4,400, 1,535 employees drawing \$4,200, 154 employees drawing \$4,100, 2,371 employees drawing \$4,000, 1,489 employees drawing \$3,900, 2,954 employees drawing \$3,800, 1,602 employees drawing \$3,700, 3,196 employees drawing \$3,600, 2,105 employees drawing \$3,500, 2,019 employees drawing \$3,400, 2,749 employees drawing \$3,300, 4,613 employees drawing \$3,200, 2,011 employees drawing \$3,100, 4,191 employees drawing \$3,000, 4,263 employees drawing \$2,900, 9,425 employees drawing \$2,800, 8,177 employees drawing \$2,700, 15,567 employees drawing \$2,600, 49,291 employees drawing \$2,500, 23,293 employees drawing \$2,400, 26,268 employees drawing \$2,300, 16,384 employees drawing \$2,200, and 118,759 employees drawing \$2,100 each per annum. Isn't that a pretty good bunch?

Most of them had all 52 Sundays off, all of the many holidays off, including half of Saturdays, 30 days' vacation on full pay, 30 days' sick leave on full pay, comfortable working environments, many drawing large travel allowances, and retired on pay after 30 years.

Government employees constitute the favored few. They are entitled to the same consideration shown other citizens, no more, no less. They have no political campaigns, pay out nothing to hold their jobs, and are not beset continuously with demands for contributions to this and that which Congressmen must endure. Yet many draw better pay than some Governors. In 1 State the Governor draws only \$3,000, in 3 States only \$4,000, and in 2 States \$4,500.

It costs the Government \$13,000 to put each cadet through either West Point or Annapolis. In the Record of April 8, 1932, I showed that able-bodied generals and admirals are retiring as young as 45, and commercializing their Government training by drawing huge salaries from corporations, while also drawing retired pay for life from the Government. I mentioned Gen. James G. Harbord, on retired pay, and for years drawing a salary of \$50,000 per year from the Radio Corporation of America. His prestige and chance to get Army and Navy contracts does it. I also mentioned Gen. Herbert B. Crosby, then drawing \$6,000 retired pay, and \$9,000 salary as Commissioner; Gen. Mason M. Patrick then drawing \$6,000 retired pay, and a salary of \$7,500 as utility head; Gen. Pelham D. Glassford then draw-

ing \$4,312.44 retired pay and \$8,000 salary as police major, which situation since then has been changed, and I gave an extended list of lawyers and doctors in one bureau drawing large retired pay and also large annual salaries. I showed in the Record of April 21, 1932, that one bureau had 876 lawyers, some of whom, through the workings of your Employees' Classification Board, had had their salaries raised from \$1,500 to \$8,000 per annum. The Classification Act of 1923, which raised many \$1,500 salaries to \$5,000, \$6,000, and \$7,500, was put over by just such pledges as you are now exacting from Congressmen in vacation.

You entered civil-service employment 10 years ago at a salary of \$1,100, while as secretary of the civil service the Government was paying you last August \$5,600 per annum.

American taxpayers are tired of standing the tremendous overhead of Government expense—national, State, county, and city. They demand reductions. If you will send me a list of all your members who are dissatisfied with their Government pay and are willing to give up their positions, I will furnish from my district 500 qualified applicants for each position, who will gladly take the job at a lower salary. You had better let well enough alone. The people are waking up. They want pledges made to them and not to selfish groups. They want their new deal continued. They are backing the President 100 percent in reducing expenditures.

Very sincerely,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

And, because I refused in advance to pledge my vote to the employees against the President's recovery program, all of the magazines of these employees have been attacking me and misrepresenting me. You have probably noticed attacks in the papers here recently against me. The inspiration came partly because of my refusal to thus pledge my vote.

We have all received the urgent demands from the rural letter carriers associations. We have all received the demands from the city letter carriers. Today we all received the 35-page printed brief and argument from the National Association of Letter Carriers, and the strong written appeal from Hon. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, with which many Government employees are affiliated, and the strong appeal from Mr. E. Claude Babcock, national president of the American Federation of Government Employees, and from Mr. James L. Keeley, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, and from Mr. Charles E. Gibson, National Association of Post Office Laborers, and from Mr. John J. Barrett, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, and from Mr. Luther C. Steward, National Federation of Federal Employees, and from Mr. W. G. Armstrong, National Rural Letter Carriers Association, and from Mr. J. J. Fields, National Association of Postal Supervisors.

What effect is it going to have on all of us? Are we going to obey them? Are they our masters? Are we taking orders from them? Are they more influential in controlling our vote here than is the interest of the whole 120,000,000 people of the United States? Remember that when we vote against this rule we are restoring all of the basic salaries as they existed before the Economy Act was passed. If we vote "no", and against this rule, we would be voting to restore our own salaries to \$10,000 beginning with July 1, 1934. Are you willing to do that, when millions of men are still without jobs? I am going to support the President. I am going to carry out his recovery program. I am going to vote for the previous question, and I am going to vote for the rule.

MR. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

MR. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during my 19 years' service in Congress I have always hesitated to pledge myself to legislation before the convening of Congress, but I made an exception this fall and told the Government employees that I would vote to restore the 15-percent wage reduction. I also spoke to American Legion posts and informed them that I would support the American Legion four-point program, for I believe it is fair and conservative. But today I find myself in this position, and it is very humiliating to me: I expected and supposed that when these questions came before Congress I was going to have an opportunity, through a record, roll-call vote, to express myself by voting on the question of the restoration of the 15-percent wage reduction. But I find myself—and as I say, it is very humiliating to me—in the position where I am not going



to be permitted, as the Representative of a sovereign people, to express myself on a vote on this important question before us today.

I believe the 15-percent pay cut should be restored. During the special session of Congress last spring Congress passed the Economy Act, which was for the express purpose of balancing the Budget, a great many of us voted for reason we wanted to balance the Budget and keep the Government expenditures within our income, but the Budget has not been balanced. However, hundreds of millions of dollars—yes, running up into the billions—have been found spent in governmental activities of many kinds. I recognize it was necessary to have the Federal Government provide relief for those who were unemployed and in distress, and I am not opposed to the Federal Government's furnishing relief to the needy people of our country, but under the N.R.A. there was a system of codes established regulating the hours of labor, setting minimum wages, and fixing maximum hours of labor. Under the N.R.A. codes, any man who is classified as a skilled worker today who is now working under the C.W.A. relief program gets \$1.20 an hour. This situation was brought to my attention just a few days ago. I was sitting in my office at home when a contractor who was constructing a large church in my home city of Youngstown, Ohio, came in and said to me, "COOPER, I am in trouble and I have come to see if you can help me." I said, "What is the matter?" He said, "You know I have the contract to construct a large church, and I am being held up. I cannot get stonemasons. I pay the regular union scale of wages, \$1.12 per hour for 8 hours' work per day, for which they receive \$9." He stated he had "4 stonemasons, but I need 8 more. I have 6 months' work for them." I said "Why can't you get them?" He said, "They have all gone to the C.W.A., where they get \$1.20 an hour." I call attention to this matter in order to show that the Government is paying a higher wage to C.W.A. workers than the wage paid in private industry.

The standard of wages fixed under the N.R.A. and increasing production costs certainly has increased the cost of living. I am just as much concerned in increasing the wages of our Government employees as I am those on the outside who are working under the C.W.A., for they must meet increased living costs also.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. As I said, I find myself today in the humiliating situation that I will not have an opportunity to express myself in a direct vote on this question by reason of the adoption of a rule which prohibits me from doing so. In other words, I am denied the duty of representing the people of my district.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would rather not yield just now. I would rather finish first.

A few moments ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] made a bitter attack upon the Republican Party and upon the Republican administrations of the past. I believe I voice the sentiment of every Republican on this side of the House when I say that we are ready and willing at all times to assist President Roosevelt in putting through any constructive program which he has to offer. We have no desire to oppose the present administration in matters of vital interest to our country. Does the gentleman from New York forget? I was here, and there are Members in this Chamber who were here at that time, when we declared war on the Imperial Government of Germany, when we had a Democratic President, and when he asked for legislation to prosecute that war and carry it to a successful conclusion. Was it the Democratic leadership of the House that put that program through? No. The Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Mr. Dent, refused to handle the legislation. The Speaker of the House was not with the President in his program. The Democratic floor leader, Claude Kitchin, a man whom I loved, and his name is revered, he

has passed away now, was not with the Democratic President, and it had to fall upon the patriotic Republican membership of this House, led by the Honorable Julius Kahn, the husband of our honored colleague, Mrs. KAHN, from California—Julius Kahn, who was the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Military Affairs; and through his leadership President Wilson's program to prosecute the war was carried out. Today the Republican Party stands ready to do its part and help the President of the United States to bring us out of this terrible situation that we find our country in at this time.

The gentleman from New York criticized the Republican Party's attitude toward labor. I say to you, and it cannot be successfully contradicted, that every constructive piece of legislation in the interest and for the benefit of labor during the last 12 or 14 years has been enacted by a Republican administration and a Republican Congress. [Applause.] I do not forget that my friend Congressman KELLY, a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, was the author of a bill that increased the salaries of postal employees \$300 a year and placed them on a 44-hour week basis; but now they have had that \$300 taken away from them, and some of the privileges which were granted to them under a Republican Congress have been taken away from them also.

The gentleman from New York charges the Republican Party with being the enemy of the laboring classes. If my time would permit, I could call attention to many acts of Congress for the benefit of labor during the last 10 years of Republican Party administration. It was under a Republican administration that the child labor amendment was passed; 22 States have ratified that same. If you will examine the record and see what States have ratified the amendment, you will find that more than three quarters of them are Republican States and not Democratic States. So I say, my friends, after many years' service in this House, it is with humility that I stand here, as the Representative of a sovereign group of people in my district, and be deprived of the opportunity to express my views on important legislation of this character, on account of the rule which you will adopt for the passage of this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed all the time allotted to him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anything in particular I could say that would tend to clarify the issue presented by this resolution. I think it rather important, however, toward the close of the debate to reassert, and I do it upon my responsibility as a member of the Committee on Rules, the statement frequently made in this debate by the gentleman from Virginia, the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, and by others, that the adoption of this rule as now presented, affecting as it does, only title II to the pending bill, does not and cannot in any wise affect the rights of any committee of this House having jurisdiction of those matters, either post-office matters, or veterans' matters, to hereafter report legislation to this House for its approval that may change the basic law now in existence with reference to the compensation that is being paid. Let there be no mistake about this. There cannot be any mistake about it.

There is only one issue presented by this rule. I admit it is a so-called "gag rule"; I admit it violates the ordinary procedure of this House. I have many times heretofore discussed the necessity of such rules under our system of party organization as a matter of party policy; so I do not want to rehash those old arguments. It is done by our friends on the Republican side of the House when they are in control, and it will always be done by the party in control as long as we have our present parliamentary system of party government.

The only issue presented here today, therefore, is whether or not this House shall carry out the recommendations of the President of the United States after thoughtful and careful consideration of all the features involved in it; after consideration of the status of the Budget for the regular



expenses of the Government; after considering the legitimate and the humane claims, I grant you, of those seeking this increase in their basic compensation.

The essential and vital thing—the only one involved in this proposition—is whether or not you will vote to sustain the President's recommendation to increase the basic pay of all Government employees 5 percent over the present reduction and require them for the next fiscal year to continue a reduction of 10 percent from their basic salaries. This is all that is involved. Notwithstanding all this argument, the veterans' interests are not jeopardized; the jurisdiction of the legislative committees of this House is in no wise imperiled by the passage of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say just a word to the Members on my own side of the House.

You can see the solid opposition of these brethren over there. Here is the beginning of a very vital and critical issue with reference to the perpetuation of the policies of the President. When the rule is voted upon I have no doubt there will be a unanimous vote on this side, the Republican side, against this bill. [Applause from the Republican side.] There you are, my Democratic friends!

A few moments ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] inadvertently said that in the last session his side came very near slipping up on us two or three times. They will whittle down, if they can, the solidarity and compactness of our party organization here in this House. This is another effort on their part. They will vote solidly against this. They have made appeals to certain Members on the Democratic side who have some particular interest to go along with them; and the ultimate hope of the Republicans is that they will get enough votes to destroy the Democratic organization in this House and to discredit the President of the United States. [Applause.]

I ask every Democrat in this House whether he is going to vote for that kind of an ambush. [Applause.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD].

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to discuss a most extraordinary and unprecedented act of a majority party in Congress. It is my belief that one of the most important points of this unique rule has not been called to the attention of this House. Eight or nine general appropriation bills will come before the House during this session of Congress. In any one of these bills the provisions of the Economy Act could be altered or amended under the ordinary rules of the House. This rule we are about to vote on will prevent our future action of approval or disapproval. This will be the most far-reaching gag rule ever adopted. Let me point out at this time that this is the first instance when a Congress has attempted, by a rule, to legislate future parliamentary procedure relative to future appropriation bills.

If you vote for this rule, you will prohibit yourselves from ever, during this session, voting for an amendment or a change or an alteration of any phase of the iniquitous Economy Act. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], whom I consider one of the greatest parliamentarians in the House, cannot deny this statement.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfair. There is an army of at least 600,000 Federal employees who are watching and looking for assistance to this House of Representatives today. If you vote for this rule today, you are assuming far more jurisdiction of the rights of the people of the country than they considered you vested with, waiving their rights for the future. I do not see how you can justify a vote for this rule with your oath of office. I warn you majority Members of the House to take notice of this abuse while there still is time, and vote "no" on the adoption of this rule. [Applause.]

The startling inconsistency of the double policy pursued by the Federal Government in its efforts to bring about national recovery is again brought to the fore today in this independent offices appropriation bill. Hearings on this bill have brought to light the fact that civil-service employees worked 37,359 hours overtime without pay in the fiscal year

which ended last June 30 and worked an additional 45,545 overtime hours without pay during July, August, September, and October. This situation was caused by the discharge of about 25,000 Government employees throughout the country and forcing thousands of others into involuntary retirement. During the period these employees were forced to work long hours overtime, every facility the Government could command was being used to increase purchasing power in private industry by providing shorter working hours and higher pay.

The contradictory and contrary policy of excessive overtime work without pay required of Government employees has not been confined to the Civil Service Commission. It has spread to the ranks of the N.R.A. headquarters itself, although the blanket code established a maximum work week of 35 hours in the manufacturing industry and of 40 hours in other work. This inconsistency is heightened by a recent statement credited to an official of the N.R.A. that if the unemployed are to be absorbed, the whole country must eventually come to a shorter working week.

While rates of pay were being increased in private industry under the N.R.A., and billions of dollars being spent on the administration's experiments, the Federal workers have been forced to work overtime without pay and have suffered salary reductions, varying, because of administrative furloughs, of from 15 to about 50 percent. During the time that every encouraging incentive was being offered private employees, the ambition-stifling policy of barring promotions and pay increases has been adopted by the Government.

No accurate figures of the extent of the harm done the country by this double policy of liberality on the one hand and drastic slashing on the other are available. However, it has been conservatively figured that purchasing power of Federal employees in the District of Columbia alone, where they constitute about 40 percent of the buying public, has been reduced by over \$20,000,000 annually. It has been estimated that the resultant loss of purchasing power of proprietors and employees of Washington establishments has brought the total loss of consuming capacity in the District of Columbia to at least \$40,000,000 annually. The harmful and retrogressive effects of the Federal pay slash have, of course, extended in proportion throughout the entire Nation. This course is especially regrettable when we consider that the total sum paid Federal employees constitutes but 4 percent of the citizen's tax dollar, so that if all Government salaries were entirely eliminated the Nation's expenses would remain practically the same.

More than one sixth of civilian Federal employees receive less than \$1,000 yearly. The total number of Federal employees is approximately 600,000.

Vast sums have been and will continue to be expended in the present program. Six billion dollars has been loaned by the R.F.C. from February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1933. Gross farm income for 1933 is estimated at six and one third billions, a 25-percent increase over 1932. Of this figure about \$300,000,000 will represent money paid by the Government from processing taxes. The last 9 months of 1933 saw the prices of farm products increase 45 percent, to a figure averaging 71 percent of pre-war prices.

Factory employees in June 1933 received an average of 41.8 cents per hour, 27.2 percent lower than the 1929 average of 57.4 cents per hour. From June to last October wage rates showed an increase of 25.6 percent. October rates amounted to 52.5 cents per hour, only 8.5 percent less than in 1929. Can you call this consistency?

With all the vast machinery of our Government it has in whole signally failed to take into consideration the fact that maintenance of an adequate standard of pay and hours of labor for Government employees is an essential prerequisite to recovery.

The present method of determining the rate of pay of Federal workers, by means of a so-called "cost of living" standard, has been challenged by some of the country's foremost statisticians. It is charged that this whole method is based on a fallacy and a long-discarded conception of social conditions. It seems clear to me that



wages determine standards and that cost-of-living standards will necessarily follow wage standards. Whether a man will wear a coat 1 year, 2 years, 5 years, or even wear one at all will depend upon his earning capacity. To arbitrarily confine his wages to any one of these possibilities will merely perpetuate that condition, effectually paralyzing and making impossible the progress which is the chief aim and purpose of the recovery program.

In addition to the Federal employees themselves, the disabled veterans have been severely penalized by the unfair and discriminatory provisions of the economy legislation. The money saved the Federal Government has merely been transferred to the already overburdened local welfare rolls throughout the country. As an illustration of how poorly the economy legislation has worked out I will mention that, of the 51,213 presumptive service-connected cases reviewed by the special boards of review, only 21,955, or 42.87 percent, were found to be service connected. The percentage of cases allowed varied from 23.43 percent to 74.68 percent in different localities. This means that, because of the more liberal interpretation of the law by some boards of some States, veterans in many States are being paid compensation for the same disability and type of evidence that disqualified veterans in Michigan and several other States. In my own city of Detroit the percentage of cases allowed was only 30.4 percent, while the State of Texas had 74.68 percent of its cases allowed.

Altogether, the economy legislation has resulted in dropping from the pension rolls 501,777 veterans, many of whom had depended entirely upon their meager monthly pension to defray their living expenses.

In summarizing the activities of the Federal Government in the past few months it becomes evident that a twofold course of action, aiming at a diminution of the purchasing power of one group of workers and at the increase of purchasing power of another group, has been followed. A strenuous campaign has been waged by the N.R.A. to improve living conditions and assist recovery by shortening hours of labor and increasing wage scales. Not one single benefit of this program has been extended to Federal employees. On the contrary, the various administrative furloughs inflicted upon Federal workers has increased their reduction in pay to as much as 50 percent in some instances. Government employees have been compelled to work long hours overtime without compensation.

The failure to extend the benefits given industrial workers by the N.R.A. to Government employees is a grave indication of lack of confidence in the recovery program. It is unreasonable and illogical to expect the confident acceptance of recovery measures by private industry when the Federal Government implies its own lack of faith in them. Restoration of the full salary reduction to Federal employees would more than amply repay the Nation for the additional funds so expended by the returns in confidence, purchasing power, and increased employment that would result. All in all, I repeat, this should be more than sufficient reason to vote "no" on this gag rule. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, section 3 (a) of the economy bill passed last year authorized the President to investigate, through established agencies of the Government, in reference to the cost of living, and upon the basis of such facts and the application thereto of such principles as he may find proper to alter the pay-cut provision of the economy act. It is to this point that I wish to address myself for a few minutes.

As a member of that committee, I have had no opportunity to hear a detailed discussion of these increased costs of living. So, when our subcommittee was in session, I asked General Hines if he would supply, through the chairman of our committee, an estimate of the amount of money necessary for supplies in his bureau. He did so, and his letter I have before me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate this letter from General Hines as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. He stated under date of December 12 that the Veterans' Bureau was buying \$13,000,000 worth of supplies. We know these goods are going into hospitals, and that these supplies are made up of various kinds of things—stationery, clothing, food, and so on.

Before the gavel falls I want to read the concluding paragraph of this letter. I shall read the balance if I have time. In the concluding paragraph General Hines says:

It is apparent that a conservative estimate of the requirements to cover increases in prices for supplies, materials, and equipment will range from a minimum of 25 percent upward.

FRANK D. HINES.

As I said, I am one member of this committee who has not seen a detailed study of the figures with regard to the increased cost of living. I am not convinced that the cost of living has gone up only 5 percent when the Chief of this great Veterans' Bureau, a Bureau of the Government buying at wholesale, admits that the advance is from 25 percent up. This is the issue here this afternoon.

The adoption of this rule—I will not go so far as to say makes it impossible for the Government employees' salaries to be increased—but it extends the Economy Act so that the President may increase them if he finds the cost of living has increased. If he finds, however, the cost of living has increased only 5 percent in the face of such facts as I am trying to give you here, what hope have they for relief during the next fiscal year?

Let us be fair about it. I agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. He has been very fair in his discussion of the rule. However, if you vote down the rule, you will automatically in the next fiscal year restore the 15-percent reduction in salaries to Government employees, as well as stop the effect of the Economy Act as it is in existence today, because that automatically goes out on June 30 of this year. In voting down this rule the legislative provisions are then subject to a point of order and will be ruled out without a further vote. That is the issue, and that is all there is to it.

If you believe that the cost of living has gone up only 5 percent, vote for the rule if you so desire, but I can read you item after item showing that the cost of living has advanced more than that. Coal that the Government is buying has increased from 50 to 150 percent. Medicines have increased 55 percent. General Hines himself admits that a very conservative estimate is 25 percent.

I do not believe there is a Member within the sound of my voice who really believes that the cost of living has not gone up more than even 10 percent. If you vote down the rule, you will restore those salaries.

The letter referred to by Mr. Goss is as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1933.

HON. CLIFTON WOODRUM,

Chairman Subcommittee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. WOODRUM: Complying with your request that any available data be furnished showing the increase in prices of supplies and materials over and above the basic quotations used in the development of the 1935 appropriation estimates for the Veterans' Administration, the following analysis is submitted:

The amounts included in the 1935 appropriation estimates for supplies and materials by objects are:

Stationery and office supplies.....	\$296,227
Cleaning and toilet supplies.....	323,030
Medical and hospital supplies.....	1,207,816
Orthopedic and prosthetic supplies.....	411,192
Fuel.....	896,392
Wearing apparel and sewing supplies.....	294,731
Forage and other supplies for animals.....	97,964
Provisions.....	7,960,736
Sundry supplies.....	253,000
Motor-vehicle supplies.....	62,442
Total.....	11,803,530



## Equipment:

Motor vehicles.....	\$50,000
Furniture and furnishings.....	701,250
Educational, scientific, and recreational.....	300,000
Livestock.....	15,000
Other.....	33,750
Total.....	1,100,000

The basis for the development of these amounts was taken from the fiscal year 1933 price trend and the average actual prices paid during that period, as well as the price trend for the months of July and August 1933. The actual prices and the price trend do not reflect to any extent the increase in price of commodities under the National Recovery Act, since the adoption of the codes regulating the industries and manufacturers were not effective until a later date, which was after the estimates had been prepared.

A check has been made of recent purchases by the Veterans' Administration of a number of commodities and the prices paid compared with the average prices for fiscal year 1933. These increases are shown by percent of increase over 1933 according to the class of commodity purchased and represents actual increases in prices paid.

Stationery and office supplies:	Percent
Paper bags.....	30
Paper napkins.....	30-38
White bond paper.....	11
Mimeograph paper.....	36
Carbon paper.....	63
Rubber bands.....	51
Cleaning and toilet supplies:	
Laundry soap.....	13
Powdered soap.....	14
Scouring powder.....	11
Medical and hospital supplies:	
Drugs and prescriptions <sup>1</sup> .....	20-50
Smocks, physicians.....	74
Smocks, ward maids.....	89
Orthopedic and prosthetic supplies:	
Contracts are already being canceled because dealers cannot afford to furnish these supplies at contract prices. Estimated increase during fiscal year 1935.....	25-50
Fuel:	
Coal and fuel oil <sup>1</sup> .....	50-150
Wearing apparel and sewing supplies:	
Chenille, cotton.....	23
Roving cotton.....	85
Thread, cotton, black (no. 50).....	50
Thread, cotton, white (no. 50).....	55
White cotton thread (no. 60).....	62
Summer pajama coats.....	71
Summer pajama trousers.....	71
Worsted suits.....	46
Worsted trousers.....	101
White cook aprons.....	77
Cotton socks.....	120
Cotton wrapping twine.....	109

The textile code was among the first codes adopted, and consequently the material increase in prices is reflected in these items more so than other commodities for which purchases were made on former price scales.

Provisions:	Percent
Butter.....	10
Peanut butter.....	23
Carrots.....	19
Golden Bantam corn, no. 2.....	9
White corn, no. 2.....	15
H.W. flour.....	90
S.W. flour.....	75
Macaroni.....	31
Water noodles.....	13
Spaghetti.....	34
Granulated sugar.....	8
Salad oil.....	17
Tea.....	62
Cereals.....	21
Smoked ham.....	45
Milk.....	11-50

The total of \$11,803,530 requested in the estimates for supplies and materials does not take into consideration the increased price trends as indicated. Neither does the total of \$1,100,000 requested for equipment reflect any price increases that the current quotations indicate.

It is apparent that a conservative estimate of the requirements to cover increase in prices for supplies, materials, and equipment will range from a minimum of 25 percent upward.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Administrator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

<sup>1</sup> These percentages of increase are estimated, based upon the current prices. No actual figures are available on these items.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, when this rule was first proposed, frankly I was against it. But I would be untrue to myself if I did not take this opportunity of saying that since I have the assurance of those in charge on this side of the House that this rule cannot and will not be used to prevent the correction of those abuses of our veterans which have become so painfully apparent during the past year, I am going to support this resolution.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SHOEMAKER].

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has this afternoon listened to the Republicans tell the Democrats how bad they are and then it has listened to the Democrats tell the Republicans how bad they have been. The result of it will probably be that the Nation at large will believe both sides and vote Farmer-Labor henceforth.

We were all elected here to represent our people. I do not know of any reason in the world why we should come here and draw our salaries if we are going to make such rules as will prevent the expression of our opinions and which will prevent us from having a single thing to say with regard to the legislation that is being passed. We might just as well be told: Here it is, swallow it.

We hear the argument about one side wanting to hurt the President and the other side wanting to hurt the President. I am going to tell you that nothing will hurt the Democratic Party or the President more in the eyes of the public than to pass this rule. You are destroying every semblance of democracy. You are destroying the purpose and intent of this House. You are destroying absolutely what you were sent here to do. You are dodging the issue.

We owe something to these Federal employees. We owe something to these soldiers—these crippled soldiers from whom we stole the crutches in the last session, if you please. That is what we did. We even cut down the burial benefits.

I opposed the ruling of our Speaker of the House today for the same reason, and I feel that this rule is the beginning of the end of democracy in the United States. I shall vote "no" on the resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KNUTE HILL].

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I shall vote with the minority in opposition to this rule. I shall do so not because of the Republicans but rather in spite of them. I have at times voted with them and shall continue to do so when I feel they are right and turn from them when they are wrong.

The question before us today is just the matter of a gag rule and nothing else. The Republicans certainly know what the gag rule is. But the leaders of our side have "outgagged the gaggers."

I hold no brief for the Republican Party. In the first place, it needs none in this Congress. The shrewd and resourceful leader of the minority [Mr. SNELL] is fully capable of protecting its interests. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] is a bulwark of strength with his lucid expression and beautiful diction—a worthy successor to the great Webster. Then again, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] also rivals in ability the great expounder and defender of the Constitution.

Again I repeat, I hold no brief for the opposition party because it is a first maxim of law that "He who comes into court must come with clean hands", and the hands of the leaders of the opposition are dripping with the pollution of unfair practices indulged in by them when they were in power. They played the game persistently and ruthlessly for 12 long years. I need only mention the methods used in enacting the iniquitous Hawley-Smoot tariff and the defeat at their hands for years of the popular "lame duck" amendment.

I address myself chiefly to the Members of the majority and especially to the leaders. I have fought this method of legislative procedure for 7 years and I shall continue to do so in the future. I am a new Member of this House, but

am not a novice at the game. For three sessions of the Washington State Legislature, as a minority member, I opposed gag rule and dictation by a select few. It is even more distasteful under Democratic leadership because I was led to believe that the Democratic Party stood for an altogether different procedure.

The three great leaders of the Democratic Party have opposed such methods. Thomas Jefferson said that the least governed are the best governed, meaning thereby that we should all be considered as taking part in shaping our own responsible activities. Woodrow Wilson sponsored "Open covenants openly arrived at." Then, why not open legislation openly arrived at? Our present great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, when Governor of New York, said:

There are three ways of defeating proposed legislation. One is the method followed in the early days of our Republic and which most truly conforms to the correct practice of a democracy. This is consideration of each proposal in open session and serious debate, in an open-minded and nonpartisan spirit and with a sincere desire to weigh its merits. If it is found inadvisable or unwise, it is then slain after a fair and open battle, and the reasons for such action are open for all the voters to examine and judge for themselves. This is the way in which all bills of real importance which have been shown any considerable approval and support by the voters of the State should be treated.

The second method is by the lash of the party whip, the demand on the legislators by their party leaders that they divide according to their political affiliations and leave to the master minds of their organizations the responsibility as to whether such action is justified or not. In this procedure the bill, when brought up for discussion, is foredoomed to failure, and all debates thereon are of a purely perfunctory nature; nor can any argument of reasoning change the final vote. There is no possible justification for the adoption of this course on bills which are avowedly nonpartisan in character.

This is the unqualified stand of our great President on this very issue, and yet the leaders draw a red herring across the trail and intimidate the timid ones by saying that if you do not vote for this gag rule you are against the President.

This method of procedure makes us look ridiculous in the eyes of the people. The duly elected Representatives in one branch of the Congress may not study, discuss, or amend a proposed measure, may not dot an "i" nor cross a "t"; but any one Member of the other branch of the Congress, the Senate, may offer any amendment to any bill and talk indefinitely on it. Is not the former a representative of the people and accountable to them the same as the latter? Is any material good accomplished by squelching the former while the latter deals with the same legislation uncontrolled?

The minority always has rights which should be protected, not only the minority party but the minority within the Democratic Party. I believe it was the great Frenchman, Voltaire, who said to one of his opponents, "I wholly disagree with what you say but will defend with my life your right to say it." The present leaders insisted on the rights of minorities for years. They fought for them. They have been eloquent in their insistence that they should be heard on every question. Read the *Record* for the Seventy-second Congress. Listen to our eloquent floor leader only on the opening day of this session, January 3:

There is no disposition to prevent any Member of the House from having every opportunity to discuss any question that he may desire during this session, and my objection does not go to that extent. \* \* \* If I can bring it about, every gentleman upon both sides of the House will have the fullest opportunity to discuss any question that is relevant to any matter that is before the House, and at the very earliest opportunity.

How does this promise by the floor leader on the 3d comport with his stand this afternoon?

Why this drastic change on the part of the leaders now when they are in the majority? Do they for a moment think that the great electorate throughout the United States will approve such a course? If so, they are greatly mistaken and had better keep in closer touch with the people back home who are taking far more interest in legislation and methods of procedure than ever before.

All these gag rules are unnecessary. We have an overwhelming majority in this House. We have all come here to enact constructive and beneficial legislation. We

are all willing and anxious to follow the leadership of President Roosevelt, believing in his splendid vision and his courage. I resent the statement made here that we are against the President. I spent 3 months of my time this summer in going about my district urging people to stand back of him in his N.R.A. program, because I heartily believe in it and want the main features of it to become permanent.

As to the leadership in this House, we will gladly follow it when it is reasonable. But a considerable number of us who will gladly follow wise leadership absolutely refuse to be blindly driven by autocratic bosses. We demand a part in the consideration, the discussion, and the reshaping, where necessary, of proposed legislation. If our leaders or their leadership is so weak that they cannot hold our 200 majority in line without a gag rule, may I respectfully submit that they resign and give somebody a chance who can hold us in line. [Applause.] They can hold us in line for the fine policies advocated by our President if they will lead us, if they will counsel with us, if they will guide us. But the time has come now at the beginning of this new session when by the eternal gods there are going to be Members on this side of the House who will not be driven like sheep or moved like pawns on a chessboard. We are willing to cooperate, but only as men with men, with our full rights and responsibilities to our constituents recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time, 5½ minutes, to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, a little more than 100 of us this morning cast our vote in opposition to the decision handed down by the Speaker, whom we all love, because we felt it was adding a regrettable chapter to the parliamentary history that is being written in the series of decisions and precedents in accumulation since the beginning of this body. I feel that some of those who voted, perhaps out of a mistaken sense of loyalty, to sustain that decision and let it stand for all time in the *Record* of this House may by this time have discovered that it was not their well-considered judgment. I hope on second thought they will feel that they can vote with the group here that is trying to resist the application of this rule, admittedly one of the harshest and most drastic that has ever been brought into this body.

Let us be honest. Let us recall just what is involved here. This proposed rule not only waives all points of order, it not only prohibits any Member not on the committee from offering an amendment or having it considered, it not only applies to policies that many of us are resisting as to salaries, wages, and other benefits; it not only applies to title II of this measure, mind you, but it reaches out into the future and applies to similar provisions in all the appropriation bills that are coming in here during this session. Get that.

Mr. Speaker, I still believe with the President of the United States—as demonstrated in his message to us on the opening day—that the legislative body should function and should have some responsibility, and when the day comes when I do not think I can exercise my responsibilities or do not desire to exercise them, then I shall resign from this body and never ask the citizens of my district and State to repose in me the faith and confidence which they have exhibited so far.

Now, what are we doing today? Oh, "Consistency, thou art a jewel", is a saying we often invoke. On one side we are telling our people that the program of recovery is working, that we are speeding up industry, that we are putting men back to work, that we are raising the standards of living, that we are adding to wage envelopes, and that over all the Nation recovery is returning, times are going to be boom times, and prices are going to rise. We are asking our farmers to be patient just a week or two or a month or two longer until their commodity prices rise. Consider well the figures that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Goss] has read.

Then, while we try to convince our people that recovery is here and that purchasing power is and must be increased,



to this group composed of Federal employees and the veterans we say that such times are not here and that living costs have not risen to a point where we can restore these wage cuts.

We may make many artful statements here regarding the application and meaning of this rule, but we know that here and now is the fight. You cannot deceive the Federal employees, whose representative sits in his customary seat up there. You cannot deceive the veterans' organizations, two national commanders of which have been sitting in the galleries this afternoon. You cannot deceive the people who still look to you for responsible performance of duty.

Let us defeat this rule, I plead with you, my colleagues, and I do believe that you will then see the members of the Rules Committee scurrying around and bringing in a rule more to our liking.

I have voted for gag rules, but certainly not a rule of this breadth, certainly not a rule so wide in its application, certainly not a rule so repugnant to all sense of legislative responsibility.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KVALE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know the gentleman's interest in humane legislation and in labor, but does not the gentleman know that the figures prepared by the Department of Labor itself show that the average wage of the industrial worker in this country is much lower than that paid to Government employees?

Mr. KVALE. I have a suspicion that that is not the complete picture. I also have a suspicion that the gentleman from Alabama, with his diligence and conscience, is, today, performing a task that to him is personally distasteful.

I speak now my sentiments, and I venture to say I voice the feelings of all the Membership of this House, when I say I thank God every day I live that we have in the White House a man with the vision, a man with the courage, a man with a grasp of the situation, and a man with the heart and the judgment of Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.] But I reserve to myself the right to differ with him. I reserve to myself the right to hold the belief, when I have it, that he is not fully informed. I reserve to myself the right to believe that sometimes, from some sides, he has the pressure of great and organized forces of wealth and power and not the true picture that comes from the inarticulate, from the defenseless, and from the unorganized.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not true that if we adopt this rule we are assassinating here today the right of free speech, the right of individual opinion, and the right of individual judgment for the rest of the session?

Mr. KVALE. I might not use quite as forceful language as that, but certainly—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the majority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, some reference was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] to an interview which I was said to have given with reference to special rules. I think the Members of this House know my position with reference to rules generally, for I have expressed it often enough.

I was speaking at that time of the necessity demanded at the special session, with the emergency bills which were proposed and had to be passed without delay, and necessarily under special rules. I said I hoped that no such necessity would arise in the future nor did I think it would. I said that personally I favored the consideration of legislation on the floor of the House under the general rules of the House, insofar as it could be done.

The gentleman from New York himself knows, as we all know, that in every session of Congress the time comes when it is necessary to propose a rule, as it became necessary in this particular instance.

The same paper which carried the interview with me to which the gentleman refers a few days ago carried the statement, before the words of the gentleman from New York and the Senator from Oregon were cold on their lips, that they were not going to show any partisanship; that they were going along; and yet that statement gave the names of members of the Republican Party who had been delegated to sit constantly on the floor of the House, watch the legislative proceedings—with what purpose? Not to offer helpful legislation, but to criticize and condemn whenever opportunity offered. Undoubtedly the people will appraise such partisan criticism at its true value.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, last March we were in the midst of a great fight. It is not over, but we are in the midst of a winning fight against depression in this country. Last month I enlisted, as you enlisted, under the banner of the leader of the Nation—the President in the White House. I enlisted to help him as best I could, in my humble way, to carry on that fight to feed the hungry mouths in this country, to put millions of people back to work to make industry profitable, and to relieve agriculture.

And be it said to the credit of the gentlemen on the minority side that practically all of them, almost without exception, enlisted under the leadership of the President of the United States.

The fight is on today as it was then, and I for one am not going to desert the standard of my leader in the midst of the fight. [Applause.]

Is there anyone here who will say for a moment that conditions are not better today than they were on March 4? Millions of people have been put back to work. Millions of little children and women are being fed today when in March they saw no hope. Agriculture is getting better, industry and business are improving, but the fight is not yet wholly won. We cannot loiter on the way in this fight which is being led by the President of the United States.

Are you and I going to face the people who sent us here and say that in the midst of battle, when victory was in sight, we deserted our leader and turned our backs upon him? That is the whole question. That is the whole proposition confronting you gentlemen on the minority side. The people are not willing to play politics in this time and day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman know of any President within the last 50 years who in his opinion has shown more interest and solicitude to protect the interest of labor in the United States than has Franklin D. Roosevelt?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not, and I do not think that statement will be gainsaid by any gentleman on the floor of this House.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Not now. There never has been in the history of this country a President of the United States whose administration has given more consideration to labor than has that of Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.] Gentlemen who oppose this rule, and also the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], have gotten on the floor and done what some of us have chosen to term "drawing a red herring across the trail." They talk about the veterans. They talk about labor, and they have attempted to confuse the proposition now before the House with questions of relief for the veterans and relief for labor. It has been stated here time and again—

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I beg the lady's pardon, but I do not wish to be interrupted at the present time. It has been stated time and again that there is not one thing in this rule which refers to veterans or to labor or which will prevent this House at any future time from passing a bill for the relief of the veterans, or secure an appropriation, if a majority of the Congress desire that it be done. This rule applies only to salary cuts and to automatic promotions and also to certain pensions paid under private bills and the pensions of widows of soldiers of the Civil War. That is the whole

proposition, that and nothing more. The President stated the other day in his message that owing to existent emergent conditions, and the necessity for spending millions of dollars to bring relief to the people, we are going to have on that account alone a deficit this year, I think, he said of something like seven billions of dollars. He said that next year, in his judgment, it would be reduced to two billions, and he hopes and believes that in the third year we would get out of the red and be able to balance the Budget. This is by no means alarming. The per capita indebtedness of the United States is \$190, and if the indebtedness of State and municipal governments is added, it is \$250—whereas the per capita of Great Britain, with far smaller resources and wealth, is \$700. This proposition means, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations told you, \$170,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States. The President of the United States, in his effort to conserve the interests of this country and to carry on his great program, has said to you that this is a part of his recovery program.

As I view it, while personally I might differ with reference to some of these provisions, as some of you know, I believe it is my duty in this crisis, in this war, which, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] said, is greater in its effect than any war we have ever had, to stand by the President of the United States, and his effort to relieve the country—and I say that despite the jeers which I hear from some gentleman on the Republican side. And I say further, this is no time to jeer at the mention of the President of the United States; no time to jeer at the effort being made by the President to carry out his pledges to the people of the country and to give relief. It was a godsend when the President was inaugurated on March 4; and while some of you gentlemen may not agree, the people of this country, Republicans as well as Democrats, believe today that if Franklin D. Roosevelt had not become President, we would now be on the road to collapse and chaos. Every bank in the country was in trouble under the policy pursued by the Republican Party for the last 12 years; nearly every bank was about to close its doors. Business was going to ruin, the people were going into bankruptcy. Agriculture was staggering and suffering, and over 12,000,000 men were unemployed, all as a result of 12 years of Republican misrule.

What are you going to do, fellow Democrats, if I may talk to you? What are you going to do? He is your President, he is my President. He is asking you to give him this legislation. Are you going to give it to him, or are you going to say to him at the first test, that we are not going to stand by him?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. This bill, as I understand it, restores 5 percent of the 15-percent pay cut as of the 30th of June, does it not, and takes it out of the hands of the President at that time?

Mr. BYRNS. It does. It restores 5 percent of the 15 percent and gives to the President the right to restore it all if conditions justify it on June 30 or at any time during the coming fiscal year, as I hope can be done. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. I have not been permitted to debate this bill, but I have kept my mind open like an honest judge until the conclusion of the argument on both sides. I desire to inquire of the Speaker and to state this parliamentary inquiry: If the rule under consideration is passed by the House, will the provisions of the rule preclude the House from considering and passing any legislative bill affecting veterans and Federal employees, or the modifying or amending of provisions of Public Act No. 2, a bill to maintain the credit of the United States Government, known as the "Economy Act", during the present session of Congress?

Mr. MAPES. A point of order. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a parliamentary inquiry. It would not. This only affects legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. On that I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 179, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll no. 79]

YEAS—216

Adair	Cross, Tex.	Johnson, W. Va.	Prall
Adams	Crowe	Jones	Ramspeck
Allgood	Crump	Keller	Rankin
Arnold	Darden	Kelly, Ill.	Rayburn
Auf der Heide	Dear	Kennedy, Md.	Reilly
Ayres, Kans.	Deen	Kerr	Richardson
Bailey	Delaney	Kieberg	Robertson
Bankhead	DeRouen	Kloeb	Robinson
Beam	Dickinson	Kocialkowski	Rogers, N.H.
Berlin	Dickstein	Kramer	Rudd
Biermann	Dies	Lambeth	Ruffin
Black	Dobbins	Lamneck	Sanders
Bland	Dockweller	Lanham	Sandlin
Blanton	Doughton, N.C.	Larrabee	Schaefer
Bloom	Doxey	Lea, Calif.	Schuetz
Boehne	Drewry	Lehr	Sears
Boland	Driver	Lewis, Colo.	Shallenberger
Boylan	Duffey	Lindsay	Sisson
Brennan	Duncan, Mo.	Lozier	Smith, Va.
Brooks	Eagle	Ludlow	Smith, W. Va.
Brown, Ga.	Edmiston	McCarthy	Snyder
Brown, Ky.	Ellzey, Miss.	McClintic	Spence
Browning	Faddis	McDuffie	Steagall
Brunner	Farley	McFarlane	Strong, Tex.
Buchanan	Fiesinger	McGrath	Sullivan
Bulwinkle	Fitzpatrick	McKeown	Summers, Tex.
Burch	Flannagan	McMillan	Tarver
Burke, Nebr.	Fletcher	McReynolds	Taylor, Colo.
Busby	Ford	McSwain	Taylor, S.C.
Byrns	Frey	Martin, Oreg.	Terrell, Tex.
Cady	Fuller	May	Terry, Ark.
Caldwell	Fulmer	Miller	Thom
Cannon, Mo.	Gambrill	Milligan	Thomason
Carden, Ky.	Gavagan	Mitchell	Thompson, Ill.
Carmichael	Gillespie	Montague	Thompson, Tex.
Carpenter, Kans.	Glover	Montet	Turner
Carpenter, Nebr.	Goldsborough	Moran	Umstead
Cary	Granfield	Morehead	Underwood
Castellow	Greenway	Norton	Utterback
Celler	Greenwood	O'Brien	Vinson, Ga.
Chapman	Gregory	O'Connell	Vinson, Ky.
Church	Griffin	O'Connor	Walter
Claiborne	Hamilton	Oliver, Ala.	Warren
Clark, N.C.	Harlan	Oliver, N.Y.	Weaver
Cochran, Mo.	Harter	Owen	Werner
Coffin	Hastings	Palmisano	West, Ohio
Colden	Henney	Parker	West, Tex.
Cole	Hill, Ala.	Parks	Whittington
Collins, Miss.	Holdale	Parsops	Wilcox
Colmer	Huddleston	Patman	Willford
Cooper, Tenn.	Hughes	Peterson	Williams
Cox	Jeffers	Pettengill	Wilson
Cravens	Johnson, Okla.	Peyser	Wood, Ga.
Crosby	Johnson, Tex.	Pierce	Woodrum

NAYS—179

Allen	Cooper, Ohio	Griswold	Lemke
Andrews, N.Y.	Crosser, Ohio	Guyer	Lesinski
Arens	Crowther	Haines	Lloyd
Ayers, Mont.	Culkin	Hancock, N.C.	Luce
Bacharach	Cullen	Hancock, N.Y.	Lundeen
Bacon	Darrow	Hartley	McCormack
Bakewell	De Priest	Healey	McFadden
Beck	Dirksen	Higgins	McGugin
Beedy	Ditter	Hildebrandt	McLean
Beiter	Dondero	Hill, Knute	McLeod
Blanchard	Doutrich, Pa.	Hill, Samuel B.	Maloney, Conn.
Boileau	Dowell	Hoeppel	Mapes
Bolton	Dunn	Holmes	Marland
Britten	Durgan, Ind.	Hooper	Marshall
Brumm	Eaton	Hope	Martin, Colo.
Buck	Edmonds	Imhoff	Martin, Mass.
Buckbee	Elcher	Jacobsen	Mead
Burke, Calif.	Ellenbogen	James	Meeks
Burnham	Eltse, Calif.	Jenckes, Ind.	Merritt
Carter, Calif.	Englebright	Jenkins, Ohio	Millard
Carter, Wyo.	Evans	Johnson, Minn.	Monaghan, Mont.
Cartwright	Fish	Kahn	Mott
Cavichia	Fitzgibbons	Kelly, Pa.	Moynihan, Ill.
Chase	Focht	Kenney	Murdock
Chavez	Foss	Kinzer	Musselwhite
Christianson	Frear	Kniffin	Nesbit
Clarke, N.Y.	Gifford	Knutson	O'Malley
Cochran, Pa.	Gilchrist	Kopplemann	Peavey
Collins, Calif.	Gillette	Kurtz	Polk
Condon	Goodwin	Kvale	Powers
Connery	Goss	Lambertson	Ramsay
Connolly	Gray	Lanzetta	Randolph



Ransley	Shoemaker	Swick	Welch
Reece	Simpson	Taber	White
Reed, N.Y.	Sinclair	Taylor, Tenn.	Whitley
Rich	Sirovich	Thurston	Wigglesworth
Richards	Smith, Wash.	Tobey	Withrow
Rogers, Mass.	Snell	Traeger	Wolcott
Rogers, Okla.	Somers, N.Y.	Treadway	Wolfenden
Sadowski	Stalker	Truax	Wolverton
Schulte	Stokes	Turpin	Wood, Mo.
Scrugham	Strong, Pa.	Waldron	Woodruff
Secrest	Studley	Wallgren	Young
Seger	Sutphin	Wearin	Zioncheck
Shannon	Swank	Weideman	

## NOT VOTING—35

Abernethy	Douglass	Kee	Pou
Andrew, Mass.	Fernandez	Kennedy, N.Y.	Reld, Ill.
Brown, Mich.	Foulkes	Lee, Mo.	Romjue
Cannon, Wis.	Gasque	Lehlbach	Sabath
Carley, N.Y.	Green	Lewis, Md.	Stubbs
Corning	Hart	Maloney, La.	Sweeney
Cummings	Hess	Mansfield	Tinkham
Dingell	Hollister	Muldowney	Wadsworth
Disney	Howard	Perkins	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mansfield (for) with Mr. Wadsworth (against).  
 Mr. Pou (for) with Mr. Lehlbach (against).  
 Mr. Lewis of Maryland (for) with Mr. Maloney of Louisiana (against).  
 Mr. Cummings (for) with Mr. Fernandez (against).

## Additional general pairs:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Green with Mr. Muldowney.  
 Mr. Gasque with Mr. Hollister.  
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Perkins.  
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Hess.  
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Reld of Illinois.  
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Tinkham.  
 Mr. Carley with Mr. Foulkes.  
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Kee.  
 Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Lee of Missouri.  
 Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Dingell.  
 Mr. Stubbs with Mr. Kennedy of New York.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. STUBBS of California, is ill and desires me to express his vote as "aye" on this question.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is not in order. The vote has not yet been announced.

Mr. SNELL. Now, the gentleman is either going to put in these telegrams or else the others are not going in.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection if they are in reference to the vote. I thought the gentleman was about to ask unanimous consent for some other purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. These announcements are not proper, as I understand it, until after the vote is announced.

Mr. SNELL. I will admit that they should never be put in; but, if you are going to put them in on that side, we are going to put them in on this side.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We have no objection, after the vote is announced.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have these three short telegrams read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the telegrams may be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Congressman HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,  
*Republican Whip:*

I am opposed to all gag rule forbidding amendments to appropriation bill. You are authorized to pair me accordingly.  
 WM. E. HESS, Member of Congress.

Hon. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,  
*New House Office Building:*

Please record me voting against rule on independent office bill. Still in hospital.

WILLIAM E. HESS, Member of Congress.

Hon. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,  
*Member of Congress, New House Office Building:*

Vote me "no", rule on independent offices bill; making statement of my enforced absence because of important business.

JOHN B. HOLLISTER, Member of Congress.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SNELL. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 192, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

## YEAS—197

Adair	Crowe	Kennedy, Md.	Reilly
Adams	Crump	Kerr	Richardson
Allgood	Darden	Kleberg	Robertson
Arnold	Deen	Kloeb	Robinson
Auf der Heide	Delaney	Kocialkowski	Rogers, N.H.
Ayres, Kans.	Dickinson	Lambeth	Rudd
Bailey	Dickstein	Lamneck	Ruffin
Bankhead	Dies	Lanham	Sanders
Beam	Dobbins	Larrabee	Sandlin
Berlin	Dockweiler	Lea, Calif.	Schaefer
Biermann	Doughton, N.C.	Lewis, Colo.	Schuetz
Bland	Doxey	Lindsay	Sears
Blanton	Drewry	Lozier	Shallenberger
Bloom	Driver	Ludlow	Sisson
Boehne	Duffey	McCarthy	Smith, Va.
Boylan	Duncan, Mo.	McClintic	Smith, W.Va.
Brennan	Edmiston	McDuffie	Snyder
Brooks	Ellzey, Miss.	McFarlane	Spence
Brown, Ga.	Faddis	McGrath	Strong, Tex.
Brown, Ky.	Farley	McKeown	Sullivan
Browning	Fiesinger	McMillan	Summers, Tex.
Brunner	Fitzpatrick	McReynolds	Tarver
Buchanan	Flannagan	McSwain	Taylor, Colo.
Bulwinkle	Fletcher	Martin, Oreg.	Terry, Ark.
Burke	Ford	May	Thom
Burke, Nebr.	Frey	Miller	Thomason
Busby	Fuller	Milligan	Thompson, Ill.
Byrns	Gambrill	Mitchell	Thompson, Tex.
Cady	Gavagan	Montague	Turner
Caldwell	Glover	Montet	Umstead
Cannon, Mo.	Goldsborough	Moran	Underwood
Carden, Ky.	Greenway	Morehead	Utterback
Carmichael	Greenwood	Norton	Vinson, Ga.
Carpenter, Kans.	Gregory	O'Brien	Vinson, Ky.
Cary	Griffin	O'Connell	Walter
Celler	Hamilton	O'Connor	Warren
Chapman	Harlan	Oliver, Ala.	Weaver
Church	Harter	Oliver, N.Y.	Werner
Hastings	Hastings	Owen	West, Ohio
Hill, Ala.	Hill, Ala.	Palmisano	West, Tex.
Holdale	Holdale	Parks	Whittington
Huddleston	Huddleston	Parsons	Wilcox
Hughes	Hughes	Patman	Willford
Jeffers	Jeffers	Peterson	Williams
Johnson, Okla.	Johnson, Okla.	Pettengill	Wilson
Johnson, Tex.	Johnson, Tex.	Peyser	Wood, Ga.
Johnson, W.Va.	Johnson, W.Va.	Pierce	Woodrum
Jones	Jones	Prall	
Keller	Keller	Rankin	
Kelly, Ill.	Kelly, Ill.	Rayburn	

## NAYS—192

Allen	Culkin	Healey	Mapes
Andrews, N.Y.	Cullen	Higgins	Marland
Arens	Darrow	Hildebrandt	Marshall
Ayers, Mont.	De Priest	Hill, Knute	Martin, Colo.
Bacharach	Dirksen	Hill, Samuel B.	Martin, Mass.
Bacon	Ditter	Hoeppel	Mead
Bakewell	Dondero	Holmes	Meeks
Beck	Doutrich, Pa.	Hooper	Merritt
Beiter	Dowell	Hope	Millard
Black	Dunn	Imhoff	Monaghan, Mont.
Blanchard	Durgan, Ind.	Jacobsen	Mott
Boileau	Eagle	James	Moynihan, Ill.
Bolton	Eaton	Jenckes, Ind.	Murdock
Britten	Edmonds	Jenkins, Ohio	Musselwhite
Brumm	Elcher	Johnson, Minn.	Nesbit
Buck	Ellenbogen	Kahn	O'Malley
Buckbee	Eltse, Calif.	Kelly, Pa.	Parker
Burke, Calif.	Englebright	Kenney	Peavey
Burnham	Evans	Kinzer	Polk
Carpenter, Nebr.	Fish	Kniffin	Powers
Carter, Calif.	Fitzgibbons	Knutson	Ramsay
Carter, Wyo.	Focht	Kopplemann	Ramspeck
Cartwright	Foss	Kramer	Randolph
Castellow	Frear	Kurtz	Ransley
Cavicchola	Fulmer	Kvale	Reed, N.Y.
Chase	Gifford	Lambertson	Rich
Chavez	Gilchrist	Lanzetta	Richards
Christianson	Gillespie	Lehr	Rogers, Mass.
Claiborne	Gillette	Lemke	Rogers, Okla.
Clarke, N.Y.	Goodwin	Lesinski	Sadowski
Cochran, Pa.	Goss	Lloyd	Schulte
Collins, Calif.	Granfield	Luce	Scrugham
Condon	Gray	Lundeen	Secrest
Connelly	Griswold	McCormack	Seger
Cooper, Ohio	Guyer	McFadden	Shannon
Cravens	Haines	McGugin	Shoemaker
Crosser, Ohio	Hancock, N.C.	McLean	Simpson
Crowther	Hancock, N.Y.	McLeod	Sinclair
	Hartley	Maloney, Conn.	Sirovich

Smith, Wash.	Swick	Truax	Wigglesworth
Snell	Taber	Turpin	Withrow
Somers, N.Y.	Taylor, S.C.	Waldron	Wolcott
Stalker	Taylor, Tenn.	Wallgren	Wolfenden
Stokes	Terrell, Tex.	Wearin	Wolverton
Strong, Pa.	Thurston	Weideman	Wood, Mo.
Studley	Tobey	Welch	Woodruff
Sutphin	Traeger	White	Young
Swank	Treadway	Whitley	Zioncheck

## NOT VOTING—41

Abernethy	Disney	Kee	Reid, Ill.
Andrew, Mass.	Douglass	Kennedy, N.Y.	Romjue
Beedy	Fernandez	Lee, Mo.	Sabath
Brown, Mich.	Foulkes	Lehlbach	Steagall
Cannon, Wis.	Gasque	Lewis, Md.	Stubbs
Carley, N. Y.	Green	Maloney, La.	Sweeney
Corning	Hart	Mansfield	Tinkham
Cummings	Henney	Muldowney	Wadsworth
Dear	Hess	Perkins	
DeRouen	Hollister	Pou	
Dingell	Howard	Reece	

So the resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. Mansfield (for) with Mr. Wadsworth (against).  
 Mr. Pou (for) with Mr. Lehlbach (against).  
 Mr. Lewis of Maryland (for) with Mr. Maloney of Louisiana (against).  
 Mr. Cummings (for) with Mr. Fernandez (against).

## General pairs:

Mr. Hart with Mr. Reid of Illinois.  
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Beedy.  
 Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Hess.  
 Mr. Green with Mr. Muldowney.  
 Mr. Gasque with Mr. Hollister.  
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Perkins.  
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Reece.  
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Tinkham.  
 Mr. Carley of New York with Mr. Foulkes.  
 Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Lee of Missouri.  
 Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Dingell.  
 Mr. Stubbs with Mr. Kennedy of New York.  
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Henney.  
 Mr. Dear with Mr. Kee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, when the roll call was had this afternoon on the ruling on the point of order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] I was at the White House conferring with the President, and was therefore unavoidably absent. Had I been present I would have voted to sustain the decision of the Speaker. I want the RECORD to show this.

## FEDERAL TAX ON INTOXICATING LIQUORS

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6131) to raise revenue by taxing certain intoxicating liquors, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in all Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "title" and insert "Act".

Page 6, after line 4, insert:

"(c) Paragraph 'first' of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"First. Brewers shall pay \$100 in respect of each brewery: Provided, That any brewer of less than 500 barrels a year shall pay the sum of \$50. Every person who manufactures fermented liquors of any name or description for sale, from malt, wholly or in part, or from any substitute therefor, shall be deemed a brewer."

Page 6, line 13, strike out "paid" and insert "paid, not including in the computation of the tax so paid the 30-cent tax imposed by section 605 of the Revenue Act of 1918."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "paid" and insert: "paid, not including in the computation of the tax so paid the 30-cent tax imposed by section 605 of the Revenue Act of 1918."

Page 7, line 24, strike out "corporation" and insert "corporation; and the term 'distilled spirits' includes products produced in such manner that the person producing them is a rectifier within the meaning of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

Page 8, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 12. That section 5 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1918', approved March 3, 1917, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Whoever shall order, purchase, or cause intoxicating liquors to be transported in interstate commerce, except for scientific, sacramental, medicinal, and mechanical purposes, into any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, the laws of which prohibit the manufacture or sale therein of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both; and for any subsequent offense shall be imprisoned not more than 1 year."

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend or repeal any provision of section 1110 of the Revenue Act of 1917."

Page 8, line 4, change section 12 to section 13.

Page 8, line 8, strike out "for sale."

Page 8, line 8, strike out "for sale."

Page 8, line 24, strike out "or."

Page 9, lines 1 and 2, strike out "held on the effective date of this title by any person and."

Page 9, line 3, strike out "sale" and insert "Sale; or."

"(g) Any regularly established common carrier receiving, transporting, delivering, or holding for transportation or delivery distilled spirits in the ordinary course of its business as a common carrier."

Page 10, line 9, after "stamp" insert ", except that in the case of stamps for containers of less than one half pint the price shall be one quarter of 1 cent for each stamp."

Page 11, line 23, after "title," insert "or who places any distilled spirits in any bottle which has been filled and stamped under this title without destroying the stamp previously affixed to such bottle."

Page 12, line 3, after "sells" insert "or transfers."

Page 12, line 7, after "both," insert "Any officer authorized to enforce any provisions of law relating to internal-revenue stamps is authorized to enforce the provisions of this section and the provisions of section 7 of the act of March 3, 1897, relating to the bottling of distilled spirits in bond."

Page 12, strike out all of section 208, and insert:

"SEC. 208. This title shall take effect on the thirtieth day following the date of the enactment of this act, except that if on or before the twentieth day following the date of the enactment of this act the Secretary of the Treasury finds that it is impracticable to put this title into effect on the thirtieth day following the date of the enactment of this act and so proclaims, specifying the date, not later than the sixtieth day following the date of the enactment of this act, on which it will be practicable to put this title into effect, this title shall take effect on the date specified in such proclamation. Notwithstanding the previous provisions of this section, this section and sections 202, 203, and 205 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so only to make a statement, it seems to me it is quite unusual not to send to conference a bill as important as this. The amendments of the Senate, however, are more or less of a perfecting character and the minority are anxious to join with the majority in aiding the Treasury of the United States in every way possible. So, the sooner this bill is enacted into law, the better it will suit the minority, and the whole Ways and Means Committee will be satisfied.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think the Senate amendment reducing the brewers' license from \$1,000 to \$100 is of a perfecting nature?

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman wants to get into a debate on the subject that is his privilege, but I do say that the amendments that were presented to the Ways and Means Committee this afternoon by our distinguished chairman, are of a very minor character. The sooner the bill is enacted into law the better it will be for the Treasury, because this is a money bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. For the moment I reserve the right to object to get some explanation as to why the license fee of the brewers was cut down to 10 percent of the fee that was contained in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The reason that was done was to leave the greater part of the occupational tax to the States.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman having this bill in charge the effect of the transportation amendment inserted by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It prohibits transportation into so-called "dry" States.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It is the Reed amendment without the advertising clause. Advertising matter may be sent into these States through the mail.

Mr. BRITTEN. That will be permitted under the Senate amendment?



Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Yes; but transportation of liquor into dry States will be prohibited.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, we have covered the controversial features of the independent offices appropriation bill. I believe that if the House met at 11 o'clock tomorrow, we could finish the consideration of the bill tomorrow. So far as the members of the committee are concerned, we are willing to conform to the wishes of the House, and a great many Members have expressed the hope we might have Saturday to do the work that accumulates on our desks. Some Members wish to go out of the city over the week-end. I believe if we could meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow, and if the members of the committee would cooperate with us, we could conclude the consideration of the bill tomorrow night.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when I discussed the situation with the gentleman from Virginia I thought it might be possible to work out some such program as he suggests, but on this side we have had a great many requests for time. I have at present requests for between two and a half and 3 hours. I really do not see how we could get through tomorrow, even if we were to meet at 11 o'clock.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, if we do not, it will be necessary to have a session on Saturday. I was trying to accommodate the Members of the House, but if they wish to sit on Saturday, I am willing to stay here as long as the House desires to proceed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that if we do not finish the bill tomorrow the whole matter might go over until Monday.

Mr. WOODRUM. The leadership has advised me, Mr. Speaker, that it is very desirable to have the consideration of the bill concluded this week in order that next week may be free for any program that may develop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I am constrained to object.

#### JAMES WILLIAM COLLIER

Mr. ELLZEY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLZEY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I arise to announce the death of Hon. James William Collier, a former Member of the House from the State of Mississippi, who passed away in the city of Washington on September 28, 1933. He was born near Vicksburg in Warren County, Miss., September 28, 1872. He was the distinguished son of a gallant Confederate soldier.

For 24 years Mr. Collier was a Member of this body, and during his last term served as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. At the time of his death he was a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

Because of his attractive personality, patriotism, and loyalty to American ideals, he was highly esteemed and univer-

sally beloved by his colleagues, and I am fully confident that I voice the sentiment of all in expressing profound regret of his death.

#### PATRICK HENRY

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce the death of Hon. Patrick Henry, who represented the Third District of Mississippi in the Fifty-seventh Congress for the term beginning March 4, 1901, and ending March 3, 1903.

Patrick Henry was born near Helena, in Phillips County, Ark., on February 15, 1861. With his parents he moved to Vicksburg in 1865, where he died on December 29, 1933. He was educated in the common schools, attended the United States Military Academy, and was for 2 years a student at the University of Mississippi. At the age of 21 he was admitted to the bar and from the first he was attracted to the public service.

Patrick Henry possessed a magnetic personality and was the central figure in any group where he appeared. He knew how to make and keep friends. He was exceedingly popular and one promotion after another in public life came to him.

Shortly after his admission to the bar he was elected attorney for the city of Vicksburg. He resigned as State senator to become district or prosecuting attorney of the judicial district in which he lived. While occupying the position of district attorney he was appointed circuit judge, and in a little more than a year after his appointment to the bench he was nominated and elected a Member of Congress from the Third District of Mississippi.

The Third Congressional District, prior to the redistricting act of 1902, is substantially the Third District of the present time. At the time of the service of Judge Henry, Warren County was in the district and Holmes County was not; Humphreys County at present in the district, had not been created.

After serving Congress for one term, Judge Henry retired and was successfully engaged in the practice of law until the time of his death. He continued to maintain an interest in political and public affairs and exercised a potent influence in shaping and controlling public opinion throughout his long career.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CARLEY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. SABATH, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. KENNEDY of New York, for the balance of the week, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. LEE of Missouri (at the request of Mr. MILLIGAN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. PERKINS, indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. MALONEY of Louisiana, indefinitely, on account of important official business.

To Mr. FERNANDEZ, indefinitely, on account of important official business.

#### ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 6131

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 218

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to sign the enrolled bill of the House (H.R. 6131).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

## THE ECONOMY ACT

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said by many Members of the House today that if we vote against the rule it meant a vote against the President's program. I wish to state that is not my opinion. I have supported many of the President's measures, such as the National Industrial Recovery Act, the public-works program, the act guaranteeing the safety of bank deposits, the Home Owners' Loan Act, and many other progressive measures. In fact, I do not hesitate to say that President Roosevelt is one of the most progressive men ever chosen by the citizens of the United States to be their Chief Executive.

It is true, like many other Members of Congress, I did not support the economy bill, because I do not believe it is economy to take away any compensations or pensions from our ex-service men and their dependents; neither do I believe it is economy to reduce the salaries of Federal employees 15 percent. There are many men and women with big responsibilities employed by the Government whose salaries are less than \$60 a month. I believe that part of the Economy Act which took away the pensions and compensations from World War and Spanish-American War veterans and reduced the salaries of Federal employees 15 percent should be repealed.

It is my opinion that if an amendment to the bill which is before the House for consideration would be accepted providing for a minimum wage of 75 cents per hour and also have inserted in the bill a 5-day, 6-hour clause, I believe it would pass. It would also manifest to the citizens of the United States that the Federal Government had taken the initiative in regards to higher wages—which means a higher standard of living. If Congress would enact a 5-day, 6-hour law and a minimum wage of 75 cents for our Federal employees, I have not any doubt the owners of mills, mines, and factories would do likewise. This progressive step should be taken by Congress.

## CIVIL WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LEHR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating therein three short resolutions adopted last week by the Michigan Municipal League of Ann Arbor, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHR. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions recently adopted by the Michigan Municipal League of Ann Arbor, Mich.:

## CIVIL WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the C.W.A., through decentralized administration, has promptly given employment to many who were recipients of public relief and to others destitute but not yet on relief; and

Whereas business has been thus stimulated by the distribution of purchasing power, resulting in a more hopeful and optimistic attitude generally; and

Whereas the brief experience thus far with civil works has proved it to be an effective agent for national recovery and at the same time creating many needed and useful works which would otherwise have been neglected; and

Whereas the present allotment of men to Michigan is approximately one fifth of the registered unemployed: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Michigan Municipal League request Congress not only to continue the present C.W.A. program but to materially expand it as a supplement to relief and public-works appropriations.

Carried unanimously, January 3, 1934.

Submitted by the Michigan Municipal League, Ann Arbor, Mich. [SEAL]

## FEDERAL AID FOR PUBLIC WORKS

Whereas we believe sound public works to be a most important part of the national recovery program; and

Whereas Michigan, hampered by statutory and constitutional restrictions, has been unable to take advantage of Federal aid for public works; and

Whereas only approximately half of the applications presented to the State advisory board on public works have been forwarded to Washington; and

Whereas it appears that the public works fund is nearly exhausted, a major part of which has been allotted to Federal projects: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Michigan Municipal League request the President and the Congress to appropriate additional funds to non-Federal public works.

*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the President and to Michigan's Representatives in Congress.

Passed unanimously January 3, 1934.

Submitted by the Michigan Municipal League, Ann Arbor, Mich. [SEAL]

## REFUNDING MUNICIPAL DEBT

Whereas there are many cities and villages and other governmental units in Michigan in default on their bonded debt; and

Whereas there is no existing legislation which will permit municipal governments to bring about an adjustment of their debts with their creditors except with the unanimous consent thereof; and

Whereas it is our belief that both cities and creditors will continue to suffer hardship unless some definite legal manner is provided for the adjustment of municipal debts: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Michigan Municipal League, composed of cities and villages in the State of Michigan, favor the enactment of the Summers-Wilcox bill now before Congress, which will permit cities, through the Federal courts, with the consent of their creditors, to readjust their debts on the basis of their ability to pay.

Passed unanimously January 3, 1934.

Submitted by the Michigan Municipal League, Ann Arbor, Mich.

## TAX LAWS ON INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration at this time the bill (H.R. 6574) to make inapplicable in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands certain Federal laws relating to intoxicating liquors.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Is this request agreeable to the minority members of the committee?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Thoroughly so. The bill applies only to intoxicating liquors in the Virgin Islands and the island of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the prohibitions and limitations contained in the following laws on the transportation, importation, exportation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors shall not apply in Puerto Rico: The twentieth paragraph of section 2 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, approved March 2, 1917; title II of the National Prohibition Act, as amended and supplemented; paragraph 814 of section 1 of the Tariff Act of 1930; and the act entitled "An act to provide revenue by the taxation of certain non-intoxicating liquors, and for other purposes", approved March 22, 1933.

Sec. 2. The prohibitions and limitations contained in title II of the National Prohibition Act, as amended and supplemented, on the transportation, importation, exportation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors shall not apply in the Virgin Islands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 12, 1934, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

277. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation amounting to \$12,-631 for the fiscal year 1935 for maintenance of the Executive mansion and grounds (H.Doc. No. 216); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

278. A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service retirement and disability fund (H.Doc. No. 215); to the Committee on the Civil Service and ordered to be printed.



## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H.R. 6776) providing for the examination and survey of Hashamomuck (Arshamomaque) Creek, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6777) adopting and authorizing the improvement of Mattituck Harbor, N.Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H.R. 6778) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the executive offices and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H.R. 6779) providing for the examination and survey of Moriches Inlet, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6780) to authorize certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to administer oaths; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H.R. 6781) to authorize appropriations to pay the annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and associated unions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM: A bill (H.R. 6782) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to continue its functions until such time as the President shall by proclamation determine, to provide funds for the continuance of such functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6783) to amend section 1383 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H.R. 6784) providing for the examination and survey of Goldsmith Inlet, Long Island, N.Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6785) authorizing certain officials under the Naval Establishment to administer oaths; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H.R. 6786) to amend the act of June 22, 1932; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6787) to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy authorizing trial by courtmartial of any person in the naval service charged with the crime of murder committed without the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6788) to amend section 1 of the act of February 14, 1927, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept, on behalf of the United States, title in fee simple to a certain strip of land and the construction of a bridge across Archers Creek, in South Carolina"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6789) to amend the provision in the act approved June 10, 1896, prohibiting the employment of officers of the Navy or Marine Corps on the active or retired list by persons or companies furnishing naval supplies or war material to the Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H.R. 6790) providing for the establishment of farmers' marketing centers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H.R. 6791) to amend the act of July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6792) to authorize the wearing of miniature facsimile medals, with ribbon, by personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps who

have been awarded medals; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DE PRIEST: A bill (H.R. 6793) providing for pensions for ex-slave citizens of the United States of America or its Territorial or insular possessions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALTER: A bill (H.R. 6794) authorizing the State of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River at a point between Easton, Pa., and Phillipsburg, N.J.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H.R. 6795) to repeal section 31 of the Banking Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6796) to provide for the better administration of justice in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H.R. 6797) to guarantee the principal of bonds issued by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6798) to authorize an exchange of lands between Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. and the United States at Quantico, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: A bill (H.R. 6799) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Weldon Spring, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H.R. 6800) to authorize the Secretary of War, upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, to adjust, settle, and pay claims of drainage districts and levee districts for damages on account of increased seepage and/or increased cost of drainage resulting from certain improvements on the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6801) for the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6802) to amend section 1860 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6803) to regulate the distribution, promotion, retirement, and discharge of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H.R. 6804) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to continue its functions until such time as the President shall by proclamation determine, to provide funds for the continuance of such functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McSWAIN: House resolution (H.Res. 219) to create a special committee to investigate expense of National Defense Departments; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHASE: House joint resolution (H.J.Res. 225) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on certain incomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H.R. 6805) granting an increase of pension to Leito K. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6806) for the relief of William Cunningham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUNNER (by request): A bill (H.R. 6807) for the relief of Fred L. Seufert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H.R. 6808) for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Babcock, mother and guardian of Nelson Babcock, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CADY: A bill (H.R. 6809) for the relief of Agar Christoff; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6810) granting a pension to Florence Christie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H.R. 6811) for the relief of Harry Pusateri (Puscateri); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H.R. 6812) for the relief of Thomas H. McLain; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6813) for the relief of William Henry Savage; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H.R. 6814) for the relief of John C. Cuthbertson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H.R. 6815) for the relief of William S. McClure; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H.R. 6816) for the relief of Mrs. Amber Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6817) for the relief of Andrew Amsbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H.R. 6818) granting a pension to Pearl Brentlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6819) granting a pension to Orvilla Finton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENNEY: A bill (H.R. 6820) granting a pension to Emma Hartson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6821) granting a pension to Mrs. Seth B. Wing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Alabama: A bill (H.R. 6822) for the relief of Warren F. Avery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H.R. 6823) granting a pension to Sallie Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H.R. 6824) for the relief of J. A. Cobb; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6825) granting a pension to Dorace Ben Whitener; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H.R. 6826) granting a pension to Emma Delano; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H.R. 6827) for the relief of Florence Thromans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OWEN: A bill (H.R. 6828) for the relief of the Collier Manufacturing Co., of Barnesville, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATMAN: A bill (H.R. 6829) for the relief of First National Bank, of Bagwell, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H.R. 6830) for the reinstatement of John Carmichael Williams in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H.R. 6831) granting a pension to William J. Cobble; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H.R. 6832) to refund to Lewis H. Frantz income taxes erroneously and illegally collected; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H.R. 6833) for the relief of Christina Englund; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H.R. 6834) for the relief of Ramey Bros., of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H.R. 6835) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and officers and enlisted men of the Marine Corps to accept such decorations, orders, and medals as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1552. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the executive committee of the New York Department of the American Legion, requesting that the present veterans' bureau in Buffalo be consolidated with the new veterans' hospital at Batavia, N.Y., and that this committee do everything possible in urging that the Batavia hospital be opened without further

delay; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1553. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of Municipal League of Michigan, composed of many cities and villages of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation which will permit cities to readjust their debts on the basis of their ability to pay through the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1554. Also, petition of Michigan Municipal League, composed of many cities and villages of Michigan, asking the appropriation of additional funds for non-Federal public works; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1555. Also, petition of Michigan Municipal League, composed of many cities and villages of Michigan, urging the President and Congress to create a municipal credit corporation from which municipalities can borrow on reasonable security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1556. Also, petition of Michigan Municipal League, composed of many cities and villages of Michigan, urging the continuance of the present Civil Works Administration program, and that it be materially expanded as a supplement to relieve the public-works appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1557. By Mr. HOWARD: Petition of Liberty Local, No. 1471, of the Farmers' Union, Osmond, Nebr., urging favorable consideration of the Frazier bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1558. Also, petition of Roland Maher, adjutant, Veterans of Foreign Wars, et al., Blair, Nebr., urging an amendment to the Economy Act for the benefit of the veterans, and also urging immediate cash payment of all adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1559. Also, petition of W. H. Teelmann, W. P. Warning, and Mike Faherty, board of county commissioners, of Greeley County, Nebr., requesting that the Government take over land known as the "Sand Hills" for reforestation purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1560. By Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota: Resolution by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, calling for completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1561. Also, joint resolution memorializing the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress relative to the administration of the Agricultural Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1562. By Mr. POLK: Petition of Mr. George Ryeburn and 37 other citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, asking that Civil Works administrative code be applicable to all roads, township, county, State, or Federal; that the minimum wage for labor be not less than 50 cents per hour and a 6-hour day with a 30-hour week; that all applicants be examined to determine fitness for labor and those disqualified shall receive direct relief or unemployment insurance; that no common or skilled laborer be discharged without written notice setting forth the cause for dismissal; and that all persons so dismissed shall have a right to appeal to a trial board for reinstatement; to the Committee on Labor.

1563. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Liquid Carbonic Corporation, New York City, opposing existing tax on carbonic gas used for carbonating beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1564. By Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut: Memorial of National Association of Letter Carriers, office of the secretary, Washington, D.C., urging the repeal of the salary reduction as authorized by the so-called "Economy Acts"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1565. Also, petition from the Charles B. Bowen Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Connecticut, Meriden, Conn., requesting the repeal of the Economy Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1566. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Liquid Carbonic Corporation, New York City, favoring the repeal of the existing tax on carbonic gas used for carbonating beverages (soft drinks); to the Committee on Ways and Means.